

Please let me have your attitude on these points at the earliest practicable moment, as it will determine my official conduct as a Representative in Congress.

With cordial regards, I am,  
Sincerely, yours,

R. L. HENRY.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

#### RECESS.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock meridian.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., Friday, October 2, 1914) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, October 3, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATION.

*Executive nomination received by the Senate October 2 (legislative day of September 28), 1914.*

##### UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE.

Richard W. Walker, of Huntsville, Ala., to be United States circuit judge for the fifth circuit, vice David D. Shelby, deceased.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 2 (legislative day of September 28), 1914.*

##### ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT.

Walter I. McCoy to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

##### POSTMASTERS.

##### KENTUCKY.

L. W. Springfield, Sebree.

##### TEXAS.

James M. Kennedy, Naples.

G. C. Tiller, Carthage.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, October 2, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Incline Thine ear, O God our Father, and hear our petition. Bear with our infirmities; forgive our sins; quicken our conscience; illumine our minds; and prepare us by the discipline of daily life to meet whatsoever transitions may come to us with Christian fortitude, with firm resolve to do the right as it is given us to see the right, leaving the results to Thee, who knoweth the beginning and the end. And Thine shall be the praise, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

##### CORRECTION OF ERRORS IN PENSION BILLS.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on Invalid Pensions from the further consideration of House joint resolution 361 and take up the same for immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] asks unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on Invalid Pensions from the further consideration of House joint resolution 361, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 361) to correct certain errors in H. R. 12045, H. R. 12914, H. R. 13542, H. R. 14234, H. R. 14738, H. R. 15692, and H. R. 16294.

Whereas an error was made in the report of the Committee on Invalid Pensions upon H. R. 12045 (private act, No. 50), approved July 1, 1914, Mary Quinlan, widow of John T. Quinlan, late of Company B, One hundred and fifty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, was changed to read "Mary Quinlan, widow of Thomas T. Quinlan"; and

Whereas an error was made in the report of the Committee on Invalid Pensions upon H. R. 12914 (private act, No. 86), approved July 21, 1914, Sarah C. Kennedy, former widow of Lewis H. Hurt, late of Company K, Seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, the name of the soldier was changed to read "Lewis C. Hunt"; and

Whereas an error was made in the report of the Committee on Invalid Pensions upon H. R. 13542 (private act, No. 88), approved July 21, 1914, the designation of the military service of one William H. Conklin, late of Company B, One hundred and twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, was changed to read "Company C, One hundred and twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry"; and

Whereas an error was made in the report of the Committee on Invalid Pensions upon H. R. 14234 (private act, No. 90), approved July 21, 1914, the name of David S. Trent, late of Company B, Fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, was changed to read "Davis S. Trent"; and

Whereas an error was made in the report of the Committee on Invalid Pensions upon H. R. 14738 (private act, No. 92), approved July 21, 1914, Amy Day, widow of Lorenzo Day, the name of the soldier was changed to read "Leronza Day"; and

Whereas an error was made in the report of the Committee on Invalid Pensions upon H. R. 15692 (private act, No. 95), approved July 21, 1914, Jennie L. Maginn, widow of Loughlin F. Maginn, late of Company H, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, the soldier's name was changed to read "Loughlin F. Maginn"; and

Whereas an error was made in the report of the Committee on Invalid Pensions upon H. R. 16294 (private act, No. 100), approved July 30, 1914, Malinda Logsdon, widow of Mathew Logsdon, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, the name of the soldier was changed to read "Matthew Logsdon," and the designation of his service to read "Company E, Tenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry"; that in the same report and private number, the designation of the military service of one William McCracken, late of Company B, Third Regiment New York Provisional Cavalry, was changed to read "Company H, Third Regiment New York Provisional Cavalry," and that in the same report and private number, Mary E. Greiner, former widow of Ira E. Gager, the soldier's name was changed to read "Ira E. Yager": Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the said acts be corrected and amended as follows:

That the item in the act (Private, No. 50, 63d Cong., 2d sess.) granting an increase of pension to one Mary Quinlan be corrected and amended so as to read as follows:

"The name of Mary Quinlan, widow of John T. Quinlan, late of Company B, One hundred and fifty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving."

That the item in the act (Private, No. 86, 63d Cong., 2d sess.) granting a pension to one Sarah C. Kennedy be corrected and amended so as to read as follows:

"The name of Sarah C. Kennedy, former widow of Lewis H. Hurt, late of Company K, Seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month."

That the item in the act (Private, No. 88, 63d Cong., 2d sess.) granting an increase of pension to one William H. Conklin be corrected and amended so as to read as follows:

"The name of William H. Conklin, late of Company B, One hundred and twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving."

That the item in the act (Private, No. 90, 63d Cong., 2d sess.) granting an increase of pension to one Davis S. Trent be corrected and amended so as to read as follows:

"The name of David S. Trent, late of Company B, Fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving."

That the item in the act (Private, No. 92, 63d Cong., 2d sess.) granting an increase of pension to Amy Day be corrected and amended so as to read as follows:

"The name of Amy Day, widow of Lorenzo Day, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-fifth Regiment United States Colored Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving."

That the item in the act (Private, No. 95, 63d Cong., 2d sess.) granting an increase of pension to Jennie L. Maginn be corrected and amended so as to read as follows:

"The name of Jennie L. Maginn, widow of Loughlin F. Maginn, late of Company H, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving."

That the item in the act (Private, No. 100, 63d Cong., 2d sess.) granting an increase of pension to Malinda Logsdon be corrected and amended so as to read as follows:

"The name of Malinda Logsdon, widow of Mathew Logsdon, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving."

That the item in the act (Private, No. 100, 63d Cong., 2d sess.) granting an increase of pension to William McCracken be corrected and amended so as to read as follows:

"The name of William McCracken, late of Company B, Third Regiment New York Provisional Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving."

That the item in the act (Private, No. 100, 63d Cong., 2d sess.) granting a pension to one Mary E. Greiner be corrected and amended so as to read as follows:

"The name of Mary E. Greiner, former widow of Ira E. Gager, late of Company H, One hundred and ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a few remarks concerning these corrections. I want to say that all these errors that have been corrected are absolutely immaterial except two, which were made at the Government Printing Office. I want to call your attention to the hypercritical character of these corrections. For instance, in the pension bill for Amy Day, the widow of Lorenzo Day, the name of the soldier was changed in the Printing Office to "Leronza" Day. Another criticism for which a bill has been sent back is the name of Mathew Logsdon, where Mathew was spelled with two "t's" instead of one. I think it is due to this House to know the character of these criticisms, and I think the question ought to be settled now whether a bureau of the Government on an immaterial error can nullify a law of Congress.

I want to say further that the Committee on Invalid Pensions has been short, during the time your speaker has been

chairman of that committee, of one session clerk, and that during the last Congress there were introduced 15,281 pension bills in this House, and that one examiner detailed by the Pension Office was compelled to examine all those bills, and because of that work, which was something stupendous, he lost his life. He undertook to attend the reunion at Gettysburg of the Blue and Gray, and he died there in consequence of overwork. Then we detailed another pension examiner, and we have had at this session of Congress 9,647 private pension bills introduced by Members of this House, all of which had to be examined—a most stupendous work; and not a single mistake has been made on the merits of a single bill. All of the criticisms have been immaterial and unnecessary. Of the number of bills introduced the House has passed up to this time 1,670 private pension bills.

That is all I care to say now, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the House joint resolution.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carr, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following joint resolution, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution requesting the President of the United States to invite foreign Governments to participate in the International Congress on Education.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate joint resolution of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution requesting the President of the United States to invite foreign Governments to participate in the International Congress on Education; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. MCANDREWS, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] may proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] be allowed to proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, of course I do not want to object to the gentleman having an opportunity to talk, but I think it is very important, if we want to get an early adjournment—which I think now begins to look as if it were in sight [applause]—that we should get this bill now pending before the House out of the way before Monday, because I do not know but if this rule supersedes Monday, and we can not use it for an opportunity to suspend the rules on two bills, it might delay matters, and I think we could possibly push the matter through. On Tuesday or Wednesday, while we are waiting for business from the Senate, the gentleman may have full opportunity to talk.

Mr. MANN. Probably this bill will not be out of the way Monday, anyhow; and if that is the case, I think the Committee on Rules ought to report a rule Monday displacing this bill for Monday, and possibly doing the same thing when the conference report on the Clayton antitrust bill is ready to come before the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If there is no objection, I think it would expedite business. But, pending that, I would ask unanimous consent that the rule in reference to this bill shall not displace the business in order next Monday, and that it shall not interfere with the consideration of the conference report on the trust bill when it comes back from the Senate.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to the first part of that request, I will say that there are some of us here who can not consent to that at this time. We might be able to do so a little bit later, but I shall have to object at this time; and there are other gentlemen here who would object, too.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, Mr. Speaker, I shall have to ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is that the House resolve itself automatically into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the regular order is, under the ruling of the Chair, to submit my request to the House.

The SPEAKER. That is true.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is so; but unless the gentleman is very urgent to-day, I hope he will withdraw his request for the present.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw it for the present and submit it later in the day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no objection to the gentleman's addressing the House, but I am very anxious to push this bill forward, and I think the House is of that mind.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] withdraws the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. [Laughter.]

#### THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The SPEAKER. The House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 18459, the Philippine bill, with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] in the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 18459) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands, with Mr. FLOOD of Virginia in the chair.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I should like to inquire how much time remains for general debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has 39 minutes, the gentleman from Iowa 37 minutes, and then each has 15 minutes after the reading of the bill.

Mr. JONES. I request the gentleman from Iowa to use some of his time now.

Mr. TOWNER. I yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS]. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, the bill as we are now discussing it does not in words specifically declare for the immediate independence of the Philippines, but it does state that independence is to be assured as soon as a stable government is established therein.

I have raised the question whether under that wording the Philippines could not have independence without any further action of Congress, by a simple recognition of it by the President. If independence is not to be granted—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This declaration must be read in its entirety. It says:

Whereas it is, as it has always been, the purpose of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and to recognize their independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein; and—

Now, independence can not be declared by any official, unless there is specific authority given somewhere for that official to exercise.

Mr. FESS. I will say to the gentleman that what he quotes there is not a pronouncement of Congress, but simply a statement which is not a part of the law at all. It is in the preamble, and if the preamble is not to be a part of the law, then it ought not to be here, and if it is to be a part of the law, then the statement, I think, is quite serious.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no; the preamble, even if adopted, is not a legislative enactment. It is merely an expression of the purpose or explanation. If this declaration be adopted there would still be legislative authority required to be conferred upon some official to withdraw the sovereignty of the United States from the Philippine Islands. Where is that authority?

Mr. FESS. Whether a nation is independent or not is not so much a matter for this Congress, but is a matter for the President, who receives the recognized representative from that nation. Therefore it is not so much a legislative function as it is an executive function. That is the question I am raising here.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield to the gentleman any further.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is an interesting discussion. The gentleman knows that what he says might be true of a nation with which we have absolutely no connection, but we own the Philippine Islands, and the President could not make them independent by recognizing some one accredited to this Government from the Philippines.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I must insist that I can not have all my time taken by these questions.



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It would improve the gentleman's speech.

Mr. FESS. I am inclined to think it does improve the gentleman's speech, but I do not want to have all my time taken. If what the gentleman from New York says is true, that there is no such meaning of independence in this bill, then this bill is not in pursuance of the pledge that has been made at least four times by the party in power, which is responsible for this legislation. One place you go to interpret the bill as to the policy which it means to declare is to the preceding pronouncement of the party now in power pledged to fulfill its promises. Secondly, if I were in doubt, I would study the speeches made on the bill pro and con as we hear them on the floor of the House.

Now, as I have listened to every speech on the Democratic side of the House, I hear but one note—*independence of the Philippines*. All of them except the speech of the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. JONES] have been arguments in favor of the independence of the Philippines. My good friend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BAKER] last night delivered a fine speech, and the burden of his song was that we were not giving liberty to these people, and that that was the one sole yearning of any people. He denounced our position as a great wrong. Not only was that stated by him, but it has been stated in substance by every man who has spoken on the Democratic side of the House except the chairman of the committee [Mr. JONES], and his remarks were specifically confined to the details of the bill and the history of it. The speeches on the Republican side have been in opposition to the declaration of independence for these people at this time. I think if we would take the word of the one spokesman of the Philippines upon the floor, the Resident Commissioner [Mr. QUEZON], we could not be mistaken as to what he thinks is the purpose of this legislation. I am going to differ from my good friend from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] when he says that the Resident Commissioner could not have said anything different from what he said, and that he would have lost his high respect for him if he had said anything different. My friends, I think that is a mistake. Do you mean to say that if there were a representative from Canada on the floor of the British Parliament, duty would compel him to demand independence for Canada when it would be better for them to retain the Government they now have, or that a representative from the United States of Australia, had he a seat in the Parliament of Great Britain, must make his fight for Australian independence when probably they would not want it? I say it is the duty of the man who represents the Philippine Islands on this floor to speak what is his judgment, to speak it openly here, just the same as he would speak it with me in private conversation. I do not think that because a man is afraid to speak his own convictions that is a justification for his simply refusing to speak, or, on the other hand, to speak against what his judgment dictates as unwise.

Members are confusing independence and liberty.

It has been asserted that the goal of the Philippines is liberty through independence. You fail to discriminate between liberty and independence. I want to say to the membership of this House that you must not confuse those two terms. The people may have liberty, but not independence; they may have independence, but not liberty. Canada has liberty, but Canada has not independence. Australia has liberty, but Australia has not independence. New Zealand has liberty, but New Zealand has not independence. When I was interrupted the other day with a question about the literacy or illiteracy of the Philippine Islands, after having quoted from the information given to the House by the man who knew about the situation, Mr. MILLER, and the reply was made that those islands had a higher literacy than any country south of the United States; instantly there flashed into my mind the Australian people, where is found the highest per cent of literacy of any country in the world save, perhaps, New Zealand. The people of Australia and New Zealand have liberty, but not independence. New Zealand has a state of literacy that challenges the admiration of the world. She has one of the largest and best universities in the world and one of the largest circulating libraries of any country on the globe in comparison with the number of people to be served. In the United States of Australia, according to a late statement, out of 1,000 people who applied for marriage licenses only 10 were unable to sign their names to the certificate. I doubt whether you could find so high a rate of literacy anywhere else in the world. And yet the United States of Australia, without independence and with the largest measure of liberty, is to-day the birthplace of many reforms. New Zealand is without independence and with the largest measure of freedom. Canada is without independence and with the largest measure of freedom. On the other hand,

Mexico has her independence, but what about her liberty? It would appear from recent events that she has the liberty of the jungle. Certain South and Central American countries have their independence, but what about their liberty, when judged by recent history? The Filipino has not his independence, but has a large share of liberty. You who clamor for his independence should make sure that you are not denying him liberty. This liberty has come because they did not have independence, but because of American protection and occupation. Seven hundred and twenty-five towns are already municipal governments, built upon modern American methods, in which the people have their liberty in the election of their officers and through their administration of all their municipal affairs. The Philippine Assembly is an elective body, chosen by the people. [Applause on the Republican side.] The senate or upper house is the council chosen by the American authority, but made up of a majority of Filipinos.

The object of the American occupation is not so much independence for the sake of those who rule, but rather the liberty of those who are ruled. This liberty came to the Filipinos step by step under the direction of the American Government—a chapter in constructive work not duplicated elsewhere in all the world. This people furnished a great laboratory for the American ideal in nation building. It started with the child—the mind of the child. The first step is the school.

When the American came he found less than 1,000 schools among 8,000,000 people, scattered over an island country with more coast line than has continental United States. He found a soil so rich and abundant that conservative statements say it could support as many people as now live in continental United States. In this wonderful field for agriculture he found the most primitive methods employed, which yielded not 1 per cent of its possibilities.

He found at least 40,000 square miles of timber, valuable timber, hardwood. This rich prize must be so guarded by wise conservation laws that it shall be employed for the people's welfare and progress, and not for sharp speculators and exploiters who infest those islands as all other places where opportunity opens its door for their activities.

The American finds promising developments of resourceful mines. But, most important of all, he found there a people, 7,000,000 or more, awaiting the application of modern methods of the western world. These people lived in cities, villages, and in countries. Some were civilized, some semicivilized, and some wholly uncivilized.

The census of 1903 shows that out of the total population over 10 years of age 20 per cent could read and write, while the males of voting age who could read and write was less than 33½ per cent. These figures refer to the Christian tribes. There were 1,677,525, or 24 per cent, of Christian population who were 21 or over. Of these 1,137,776, or 68 per cent, were illiterate.

Between 1900 and 1903 there were organized 2,075 schools, mostly primary education.

Besides these schools, which teach the rudiments of education, there are now a great many secondary schools of modern character.

Vocational education is in operation in many parts where school gardening is carried on quite extensively to persuade the inauguration of intensive farming, which opens a wonderful field for that people.

The schools of arts and trades mark another very important movement. Manual training is a wonderfully apt field for these people. There is at least one good institution of this sort in each of the election districts.

The marvelous transition worked by the inauguration of the American system of education approaches metamorphosis. It will require not many generations to completely transform that people in ideals as well as ideas. It will rapidly become a modern country if left undisturbed by the busybody, whose hopes and aspirations can not rise to the plane of a people comfortable and happy in the joy of the full fruition of its own powers realized through education.

This possible goal, within easy reach of the generality of this people, will not be facilitated by the constant holding out of a promise of something they do not want, and at this time could not use if they had it. Such a policy can have but one effect—a spirit of dissatisfaction, of unrest, stimulated by the agitator, whose chief concern is how to increase his own prestige, with little regard, if any, for his people.

Athletic sports, first inaugurated by our soldiers, finally took hold of the schools of the vicinities. Now, instead of the medieval sports so common in Spanish countries, the modern sports make possible a community interest, by one team playing a visiting team in the presence of a happy crowd. The game

is played under rigid rules, where the one slogan is "Play the game, stand by the rules." There is no finer moral discipline in the Philippines, as well as in America, than a well-regulated game, where the law is "Don't foul, don't fumble, but hit the line hard."

One of the most important achievements on the islands is the advance in sanitation. By expert application and the establishment of hospitals, schools for nursing, and better health regulations, better care for the water supply, better disposal of waste, and so forth, by these various applications cholera has been driven out, as yellow fever was from Habana and Panama. Smallpox, that was quite common, has no further terror, since the people are becoming immune by vaccination. The bubonic plague has been driven out. The pneumonic plague and other dangerous maladies have been successfully combated by modern medicine.

The Filipino is said to be a natural nurse when trained. This field opens to both boy and girl. In a material way the occupation by the Americans has made various towns beautiful, clean, and healthy. The coasts have been charted and nearly 100 lighthouses erected. Wharfs have been built, harbors have been improved, and shipping facilities added.

The 120 miles of railroad, much of it in bad state of repair in 1898, has been increased to over 600 miles. The old roads, many of which were mere trails, have been displaced by a thousand miles or more of splendid roads, which will permit rapid travel throughout the country. In this way most of the country is being placed in easy communication. Under this régime the head-hunters must be soon a mere memory.

There still exists some peonage, which, according to Dean Worcester, is rapidly passing by rigid enforcement of laws against it.

These are some of the things which have taken place since 1898. These advances were made to secure Filipino liberty. Whatever might be said of independence, it is impossible to say what would have been the result had not this great Republic entered upon that unselfish work. There is nothing like it in the history of mankind. The administration has been passing over to the Filipino authority in matters of interest just as fast as safety for him will permit. This has been done before his very eyes. It has been without promise of this or that. This bill is but another handle to stir up the busybody, who in turn tries to dissatisfy the native with his protector. It is unwise, unnecessary, and ill-advised. The preamble should go out of the bill altogether.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 27 minutes.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, the record that has been made by the Republican Party in the administration of the Philippine Islands is one of the proudest chapters in its history. I say that as much for the reason that it has not been treated by the Republican Party as a partisan question as for any other reason. I am proud of the fact that the Republican Party, in the inception of the responsibility that was thrust upon it, took up that responsibility with a full sense that it ought not to be considered as a partisan question. In the last declaration made by the Republican Party it was declared that their treatment of this question had always been and should be nonpartisan.

I want to present to this House now a few sentences from the Republican platform of 1900. It declares:

In accepting, by the treaty of Paris, the just responsibility of our victories in the Spanish War, the President and the Senate won the undoubted approval of the American people. No other course was possible than to destroy Spain's sovereignty throughout the West Indies and in the Philippine Islands. That course created our responsibility before the world and with the unorganized population whom our intervention had freed from Spain to provide for the maintenance of law and order and for the establishment of good government and for the performance of international obligations.

This was the declaration of the Republican Party at the very inception of our government of the Philippine Islands in the year 1900. It was a declaration, as I say, about which we all ought to be proud, and in the spirit of this tremendous responsibility that had come to us throughout all the administration of the Republican Party we have treated it in this broad, magnanimous manner.

There could have been no more splendid initial declaration of principles under which the Philippine Islands were to be governed than was issued by President McKinley in 1900, when he appointed the Philippine Commission, to which was given the powers of government at the commencement of civil government in the American occupation. It has been declared by one of England's greatest statesmen as one of the broadest and most statesmanlike utterances that has ever been made regarding such questions.

President McKinley then said:

In all forms of government and administrative provisions which they are authorized to prescribe, the commission shall bear in mind that the government which they are establishing is not designed for our satisfaction or for the expression of our theoretical views, but for the happiness, peace, and prosperity of the people of the Philippine Islands, and the measures adopted should be made to conform to their customs, their habits, and even their prejudices to the fullest extent consistent with the accomplishment of the indispensable requisites and privileges of an effective government.

Throughout the government under Republican administrations there was no politics. More Democrats were appointed as governors of the Philippine Islands than Republicans. Everywhere Democrats were appointed in all parts of the administration of the islands indiscriminately. You might go anywhere in the islands and find that the official had been appointed by a Republican administration, although he was a Democrat. It was only sought to secure the best men for the places in the islands, no matter what their politics might be.

We have complained, and we think justly so, of the policy of the Democratic Party with regard to the Philippine Islands. From the commencement it has been governed by partisan considerations. This is strikingly shown by the action of the present Secretary of State. He came here to Washington when the treaty of Paris was pending for ratification before the Senate and when one or two votes would determine whether or not the necessary two-thirds could be secured. Mr. Bryan came here and labored with Senators to secure an indorsement of the treaty of Paris. If that treaty had not been secured—there was no objection particularly urged to it except the fact that we took over the Philippine Islands—if that treaty had not been ratified—and it lay within the power of Mr. Bryan to determine whether it should or not, because it could not have been ratified by the Republicans, who could not control the required two-thirds majority—there would have been no acquisition of the Philippine Islands. And strange and inconsistent as it may appear, soon after that, when Mr. Bryan was nominated for President of the United States, he was nominated on a platform which he dictated and which, in effect, declared for immediate independence of the Philippine Islands, and made his campaign principally on that issue. He declared then over and over again on the stump that they were ready for self-government, and declared over and over again that there was no danger, and that we ought to give them immediate independence. He declared over and over again that we had no right to retain control of the islands, and made the so-called issue of "anti-imperialism" the dominant issue of that campaign.

What the American people thought about it is determined by the result of that election. They declared against the scuttled policy. They declared that it was not possible to turn the islands adrift. They declared that the obligations which we had involuntarily assumed must be met by a manly and honest assumption of our duties.

The idea of neutralizing the islands first appeared as an authorized expression of the policy of the Democratic Party in 1904. Since then it has been a favorite method of disposing of the Philippines by the Democrats. It seems easy to declare that we may enter into an international agreement with other nations by which the neutralization of the Philippine Islands could be guaranteed, as the neutralization of Switzerland and Belgium was guaranteed, but now we hear little of the neutralization of the Philippine Islands. While it might be possible to secure a recognition by other nations of the neutrality of the Philippines, to induce them to join with the United States in guaranteeing their neutrality would be impracticable. It is stated as a fact that already this administration has sounded other nations as to whether or not such an agreement could have been secured, but other nations are not inclined to take upon themselves such responsibilities unless we can offer them special privileges or concessions in the Philippines, and this, of course, we can not do. We have that responsibility, and we must carry it through until we either rid ourselves of it by a voluntary abdication of our power in the Philippine Islands or until they shall be wrested from us by a superior power.

The Democratic platform utterances of 1908 and 1912 declared, in effect, that the United States shall first establish a stable government in the Philippine Islands and then shall guarantee to them their independence. There is in this provision and in this position no ridding of the United States of her responsibilities. If we are now responsible for conditions in the Philippine Islands, we will be responsible for them ever and always, if we guarantee to them their independence. Such a proposition, in my judgment, is utterly indefensible and untenable. Under those conditions the United States would have all the present responsibilities of its position and it would have none of the advantages that may be ours by reason of the islands being part of the territory of the United States.



The position of the Democratic Party has materially changed from the proposition of 1900 in which immediate independence was the issue until the present time when this present bill is up for consideration. A change in sentiment for some reason has occurred during that period. This bill does not declare for immediate independence. It declares only that it is and has been always, as the preamble reads, the purpose of the United States to grant the Filipino people independence whenever a stable government shall be established in the islands. A stable government is established in the islands to-day. There is now a stable government established, and there has been for years. They have secured that already. What further element of a stable government is required? Does it mean a stable government of an independent character? A stable government under which the Government shall demonstrate its capacity to run itself as an independent Commonwealth among the nations of the world? There is no opportunity for that. It would be very much better, more consistent with the ideas of the Democratic Party, if they should say to the Filipino people, as they said in 1900, "We will give you your independence immediately and guarantee that you shall not be interfered with." That would be very much more consistent than their present position. There is no opportunity to demonstrate whether or not government can be secured that is any more stable than the government they have now. The Filipino people think that they are now capable of maintaining not only a stable government but an independent stable government. They believe that they are now capable of maintaining and keeping their independence. No party in the United States agrees with them in that position.

We are under obligations to President Wilson for his influence upon the Democratic Party in many regards. Thanks to him, there has been a higher standard in all departments of this Government than has ever been put into practice in any previous Democratic administration. Thanks to him no such dangerous idea as immediate independence is pressed as a policy of his administration.

It is doubtless due to the influence of President Wilson that no such dangerous experiment should be tried as was advocated by the Democratic Party in their platforms; at least, he understands the situation if his followers do not.

In his lecture which was delivered at Columbia University in 1907, speaking particularly of the Philippine Islands and applying his language directly to them, he said:

Self-government is not a mere form of institutions, to be had when desired, if only proper pains be taken. It follows upon the long discipline which gives a people self-possession, self-mastery, the habit of order and peace and common counsel, and a reverence for law which will not fail when they themselves become the makers of law; the steadiness and self-control of political maturity; and these things can not be had without long discipline.

Again he says:

Self-government is not a thing that can be "given" to any people, because it is a form of character and not a form of constitution. No people can be "given" the self-control of maturity. Only a long apprenticeship of obedience can secure them the precious possession, a thing no more to be bought than given. They can not be presented with the character of a community, but it may confidently be hoped that they will become a community under the wholesome and salutary influences of just laws and a sympathetic administration; that they will after a while understand and master themselves, if in the meantime they are understood and served in good conscience by those set over them in authority.

That is the mature judgment of a careful statesman upon this particular question. If that rule shall be applied, then the Philippine Islands will remain for many years under the control and direction of the United States. I know it is very apt to be the case that those of us who think that we ought to be relieved of these responsibilities shall take the easy course, in the belief that perhaps they could get along if they were to set up an independent government of their own; but if we are careful, and if we are just with ourselves, we certainly will not be deceived concerning the matter.

I want to call attention now to a statement of the conditions that existed in the Philippine Islands at the time of the American occupation. This statement was made by Dr. Heiser, who went there to take charge of the sanitation and medical supervision of the islands. He went there as a scientist and speaks as a scientist, and I am quoting this from an address delivered by Secretary Redfield, who says of him that he is personally acquainted with Dr. Heiser, that he has met him, and knows him to be a truthful man, and that he describes things as he found them in the islands. Dr. Heiser said:

Forty thousand persons were dying annually from smallpox, while the number of deaths from beriberi in jails and other public institutions was frightful. With the exception of the water system in the city of Manila, there was not a reservoir, pipe line, or artesian well for the 7,200,000 people of the entire archipelago, and even the water for the city of Manila was known to be grossly polluted. The dead were buried in a most haphazard manner, it being a not infrequent experience to find as many as four or five interred in a grave. The bones of those

who had died but a few months before were often ruthlessly cast out to bleach in the sun in order to make room for a more recent death. The city of Manila, which had a population of over 200,000, had no sewer system, and foul human discharges found their way directly into the esteros or canal, of which there are some 23 miles. The water in these was frequently stirred up by the lighters and other craft which are used so extensively in Manila for transporting cargo, with the result that noxious gases were constantly being liberated.

There was no food law, and the vilest class of food products was shipped into the country without let or hindrance. Amebic and other forms of dysentery soon affected the troops and others who had come to the Philippines to aid in governmental work. Subsequent experience has shown that these same diseases were responsible literally for thousands of deaths annually among the Filipinos. There was no hospital in the entire islands which had modern surgical equipment, and persons died on every hand of disease which could have been easily relieved. It was not uncommon to find many persons horribly deformed by the scars which resulted from injuries or ulcers that could have been easily cured if skilled attention and facilities had been available at the time when they had their beginning. The prisons throughout the islands were indescribably filthy and neglected.

The maritime quarantine was conducted upon a basis of graft rather than upon merit, with the inevitable result that an outbreak of plague, cholera, or smallpox in the near-by foreign countries meant the early introduction of the disease into the Philippines. There was no proper inspection of animals before slaughter, and suitable slaughterhouses where this work could have been done were conspicuous by their absence. More than 5,000 lepers were at large throughout the Philippine Islands. A few hundred were taken care of as objects of charity, but there was no attempt to segregate lepers.

Malaria prevailed in hundreds of towns in the Philippines, without quinine being available to combat it. It was no infrequent experience to find imitation quinine pills being sold at fabulous prices in the stricken districts, and the poor populace had no one to whom to apply with the hope of receiving any relief from this most intolerable condition. Sections of Manila, having a population of 5,000 to 25,000, were built up with houses so closely crowded together that there was no room for streets or alleys, and egress from these sections had, in many instances, to be made by the residents crawling under one another's houses. Manila is located on a tidal flat, and formerly, at high tide, about half of the city was inundated. As this flat land consisted of soft, oozy mud, the conditions can be better imagined than described.

There was no governmental provision for the insane, and it was no uncommon sight to see these unfortunates tied to a stake, under a house or in a yard, with a dog chain, and it often happened that during fires, which are so frequent in towns built of nipa, these unfortunates were burned because no one thought to release them. Foods and perishable provisions were sold under most filthy conditions, the common practice being to sell them from the ground, so that the dust and dirt of everyone who came to see was soon intimately mixed with the food that was on sale. It was a frequent occurrence to find small rooms, often no larger than 8 by 10 by 8 feet in which from six to eight persons were sleeping. Tuberculosis was responsible each year for perhaps another 50,000 deaths throughout the archipelago. No effort whatsoever was made to teach the people how to deal with this scourge.

And he goes on and tells about the home life of the people and the results of their manners and customs, upon the life and conditions in the islands of the people themselves. He tells what their home life was—

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. GOULDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman what is the date of that report from which he is reading and the date of the visit which the doctor made?

Mr. TOWNER. The doctor went there at the commencement of the American rule.

Mr. GOULDEN. What is the date of the report from which the gentleman read?

Mr. TOWNER. I do not know, but this is made subsequent to the occupation, of course, and is the result of his own investigation and experience.

Mr. GOULDEN. I wanted that for information, as it sounded like something quite recent.

Mr. TOWNER. Fifty per cent of all infants died in infancy. Fifty per cent of all children who were born in the islands under the old régime died before they reached even the age of 10 years. It would be impossible to describe, and I can not take the time to describe, and it would not be pleasant to describe, the conditions that existed in the Philippine Islands at that time. Much has been said about the illiteracy that existed at that time. No one knows what was the illiteracy of the islands. We know, however, that it was very large. There was a census taken in 1902, some time after the American occupation and before it could be very much influenced by American rule, and there were some 6,000 men in the islands who could read and write, but it must be remembered that this did not mean that they could read and write in any one language. There are many languages and dialects spoken in the Philippines. In fact, 74 different dialects were spoken at that time in the islands. Few of those speaking one could understand any other. It was impossible even for those of the same general race to understand those of a different tribe in the same race. There are three different races of people in the Philippine Islands—the Negrito race, which had 21 branches or tribes; the Indonesian race, which had 16 branches or tribes; and the Malay, which had 47 branches or tribes; making 87 different branches and tribes in the islands. Intercourse between them was impossible. Such tribes and peoples of that character could



make little progress, unless it was done under such a system as the United States provided. It was unwillingly accepted a great part of the time, unwillingly accepted by a vast majority of the people then, unwillingly accepted by a large majority of the people to-day.

If the American occupation should cease to-morrow in the Philippine Islands, the system of education which we have planted there, as an American system, would cease. Why do I say that? Because already there has been a rising tide of objection among the Filipinos, in anticipation of their independence, against the American school system. We have sought to establish the importance and benefit that would come to them if they had a uniform language, and at their own request have made that language the English language. We have so far succeeded that to-day more people speak English than any other language. But already there is complaint of this program. The Vizcayans, who constitute 40 per cent of the population, think the language should be Vizcayan. The Tagalogs think their language should be the national language. If the Americans should withdraw to-day, the teaching of English in the schools would cease and the tribal tongues would again be substituted. With this would come the old tribal jealousies and animosities, and the great progress toward homogeneity and unity would be lost.

In an address delivered in this House by the present Philippine Commissioner, Hon. MANUEL L. QUEZON, he pays a very high tribute to the national hero of the Philippines, Dr. Jose Rizal. Of that fine character he says:

The recognition of a national hero in any country is evidence of the national consciousness of the people thereof. The Filipinos have their national hero—Dr. Jose Rizal, who was shot to death by order of the Spanish Government on the 30th of December, 1896. The crime of Dr. Rizal was the crime of George Washington—he loved his people and sought their freedom. He paid for his patriotism with his life, and he died gladly. On the eve of his martyrdom he wrote one of the noblest poems that ever came from a patriot pen. In every town in the Philippine Archipelago the 30th of December is consecrated to Dr. Rizal; he is venerated by every Filipino, and his picture hangs prominently in every home, from the costliest to the humblest. Each and every man in every one of the so-called tribes of the Philippines regards Dr. Rizal as Americans regard George Washington.

In his greatest work, *Noli Me Tangere*, written but a short time before his death, in 1896, Dr. Rizal says:

One may accompany the course of progress in three ways—ahead of her, side by side with her, and behind her. \* \* \* We in the Philippines are traveling along at least three centuries behind the car of progress; we are barely commencing to change from the Middle Ages. \* \* \* The strife is on between the past, which cleaves and clings with curses to the waning feudal castle, and the future, whose song of triumph may be faintly heard off in the distant but splendid glories of a dawn that is coming, bringing the message of good news from other countries.

It would be unreasonable to ask or to expect that a people "barely commencing to emerge from the middle ages" a quarter of a century ago should be able to take and maintain an independent place among the nations of the world.

While that is true, if we take note of the marvelous progress made by the Philippine people during the American occupation we would not be justified in fixing any possible limitations on their capacity for progress. It is entirely within the truth to say that no other people under similar conditions have ever equaled their development in civilization in the same number of years.

I have already quoted from Dr. Heizer as to the conditions existing in the islands at the commencement of the American occupation. Let me now quote from another especially qualified witness as to what has been accomplished since that time. Mr. Daniel R. Williams went to the Philippines as secretary to the commission in 1900. In 1913 he again visited the islands, and in a work recently published he tells of what has been accomplished in the interval between his first and last visit. His summary is as follows:

Courts with a simplified procedure have been established where justice is neither bought nor sold and where rich and poor fare alike.

Brigandage and lawlessness have been suppressed and life and property are protected and respected as never before in the history of the archipelago.

The wild tribes of the islands who took heads and slaughtered each other without let or hindrance in the old days have, under the wise supervision and guidance of Hon. Dean C. Worcester and his corps of heroic assistants, entered upon ways of peace, industry, and public order. It is a work the magnitude of which is only beginning to be appreciated, even in the Philippines.

An educational system has been perfected which offers to every Filipino child a free public-school education. Nearly 700,000 children are now enrolled, and English, with its store of literary treasure, is rapidly becoming the common language of the people. High schools and normal institutes, housed in modern buildings, are within the reach of all, and a Philippine university, with full literary and professional courses, has recently been organized. Manual-training schools, which teach not only useful trades but also the dignity of labor, are being opened in constantly increasing numbers. Hundreds of Filipino students have been sent to the States at public expense, where they have received and are receiving the best technical training of our colleges.

Health and quarantine services have been organized whose work in forestalling epidemics, in freeing the islands from plague, smallpox, and other endemic diseases, and in teaching and enforcing sanitation and sanitary living among all classes, would alone justify our occupation. Manila has to her credit a new and complete sewerage system, an extended water service, an up-to-date general hospital, and a bureau of Government laboratories whose investigations into the cause and cure of tropical diseases have given it front rank among the scientific institutions of the world. The lepers of the islands, formerly scattered throughout the community, have been segregated and are now well cared for on the island of Culion. A determined fight, with every chance of success, is being waged against tuberculosis and infant mortality, the dread scourges of these people. The importation and smoking of opium have been prohibited, and a vice which threatened to fasten itself upon the islands is being effectively eradicated. Modern markets, where cleanliness is the watchword, have replaced the unwholesome and death-dealing plazas where food and drink were formerly sold, while artesian wells, furnishing that indispensable requisite for health in the Tropics—pure water—are now to be found in almost every municipality.

Transportation facilities have been revolutionized. The 120 miles of railroad existing in 1898 have been increased to over 700, with 600 miles in project and under construction. Nearly 2,000 miles of macadam roads have been built, opening up the interior of the country and making it possible for the people to market their products at a profit. The island waters have been sounded, charted, and studded with light-houses, making navigation something more than a lottery. Great port works have been completed in Manila, Cebu, Iloilo, and other places, furnishing safe anchorage and docking facilities for ocean-going vessels. Interisland shipping has been fostered and encouraged, mail routes have been extended and cheapened, and the archipelago laced with cable and telegraph lines.

A comprehensive irrigation system, financed by the Government under an arrangement for eventual reimbursement, is being extended to various parts of the islands, with the certainty of enormously increasing the agricultural output.

A well-patronized postal savings bank is in operation, encouraging habits of industry and thrift among a people noted for their improvidence. A Government agricultural bank is also gradually relieving the lack of capital on the part of landowners.

Taxation has been equalized, and revenue is now collected according to the means of the individual rather than according to class, as in former times. Despite the wide scope of Government activities the per capita contribution is but two dollars and odd cents, being less than that of any civilized country in the world.

A stable currency based on gold has replaced the mongrel and fluctuating medium which upon our coming made all business operations a gamble.

The large friar estates, which were a center of disturbance and discontent, have been purchased by the Government, and are now being sold and leased to the occupants on easy terms.

A registration act has been adopted (Torrens) which enables every owner of real property to secure a guaranteed title to his holdings to place of the questionable ownership heretofore applicable to most privately claimed lands.

Forest regulations have been adopted which protect this great source of island wealth from undue waste and destruction, and yet encourage capital in its exploitation.

A public-land act has been enacted which enables every Filipino to acquire a free homestead, and they are encouraged to do so.

Church and state have been divorced, and the people relieved of one of their greatest grievances under Spain. Freedom of worship, of speech, and of the press have been guaranteed—privileges which many Filipinos, in their sudden release from old restraints, are inclined to abuse.

Bilibid, the great island prison, has been transformed from a veritable death trap into an institution which would serve as a model for any country. Criminals are taught useful trades and as a reward for meritorious conduct are transferred to the self-governing and self-supporting penal colony of Iwahig, where every opportunity is given them to become useful citizens.

Philippine imports have increased from \$16,285,044 in Spanish times to \$61,667,901 in 1912, and exports from \$20,457,279 to \$54,784,738. Free trade applies upon all States' products coming to the Philippines, and upon all island products entering the States, except sugar and tobacco, upon which a complaisant Congress placed a limitation at the behest of the Sugar and Tobacco Trusts.

There has been a general increase in salaries and wages, and the people are better fed, better housed, and better clothed than ever before.

Baseball and tennis are becoming the national games of the country, and the rising generation not only bids fair to abandon the cockpit as a means of recreation, but to represent a type of physical development heretofore unknown among the Malay people.

This bare statement of accomplishments constitutes a record which should be a source of pride to both the Filipino and to the American. I have little sympathy with attempts to belittle the part either has taken in that splendid accomplishment. Neither shall I attempt to apportion praise. If the Filipino people had not been capable of such development it would have been impossible. It is equally true that but for the labor of as splendid a company of disinterested and noble-minded men as ever served a people, such progress would have been impossible.

Our present duty is to give them, first, all the help the present emergency demands. The European war is a hard blow to the Philippines. They will need our help in order to weather the storm. We should increase the limit fixed on their power to incur indebtedness. At present that limit is \$5,000,000, and it has been already reached. It is too small for a growing people, already numbering more than 8,000,000. If they can not sell their bonds, we should guarantee them, and this we can safely do, for their resources are enormous and capable of almost limitless development. If their tariff system needs revision, let us revise it, with regard to their interests rather than our own.



I would not drive capital from the islands by threats or prospect of an immediate or early independence. I would not adopt a policy that would discourage ambitious American youth from going there and joining with the Filipinos in developing the marvelous resources of the islands. I would give the people an ever increasing measure of liberty and home rule until the Philippine Archipelago becomes a great self-governing Commonwealth such as the Australian Commonwealth or the Dominion of Canada. I would make them ready for independence, whether they shall then demand it or not, and I sincerely hope that at such time it will be determined both by them and by us that their interests and ours would be better served by union. But if a severance of relations shall come, I would have our record of service so free from selfish purpose, so clearly in their interest, that the Filipinos will be our constant allies and steadfast friends forever.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, there was an understanding between the gentleman from Iowa and myself that I would close the debate on this side in one speech. Since that time the gentleman from Kentucky has come in, and I do not want to violate that understanding, and I will not, but if there is no objection, I will yield a few minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. TOWNER. It will be a pleasure for me to agree to that.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY].

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is with great hesitancy that I undertake to delay the committee by any remarks of mine at this time, and I should not have done so if it were not for the fact that heretofore I have spoken on this subject and my support of this bill might be taken by some, who had simply recognized the fact that I was then at difference with the gentleman from Virginia, as a change of position on my part. Certain fundamentals touching the Philippine Islands, it seems to me, can now be accepted by all men. The American people are dedicated to that conduct which shall represent the highest motives and the highest order of disinterestedness in connection with the Philippine Islands. Through no intent of ours did they come, so to speak, under our dominion. No one anticipated it in the beginning and no thoughtful man worthy of American citizenship has desired since the treaty of Paris was made to deal with these people other than with an eye single to their interests. I can not in any way accept the statement made by the distinguished leader of the minority either as reflecting the judgment of the minority party or as reflecting the judgment of the American people. No amount of theorizing as to possible commercial or actual conflict with the nations of the Orient in the far distant future will ever be sufficient to make the American people conclude that they should hold the Philippine Islands permanently as a part of America over the objection of the Filipino people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The one question that has been uppermost in the minds of Americans is, When can we in justice to the Filipinos give them self-government? That is the real issue about which men are divided to-day, some men believing that they have always had the capacity to maintain their own government if left free from foreign interference, other men doubting whether the time would come in many generations when they would be capable of such government.

For my part, I do not believe a man is wise enough to prophesy as to what will happen to the Philippines in regard to their maintenance of a government of their own. But this must happen if we are to keep faith with ourselves and with those people: We must constantly afford them opportunity to demonstrate their capacity in government, and we can never afford them such opportunities without letting them actually try government. In other words, this Government must go forward, from time to time reposing additional power, and with it additional responsibilities, upon the people of the Philippines. That is exactly what is being proposed in the present bill. I opposed the previous bill reported in a former Congress by the Committee on Insular Affairs because of the fact that it undertook to say that at a given time a certain condition of affairs would have arrived, whether it had or not. And I was not willing to legislatively commit myself to the proposal that on a given date in the future the Philippine Islands would be in such a condition that the American people should surrender entire control over that country and over those peoples. If this bill undertook to do that to-day, I would voice my protest against it and would vote against it. But the bill does not. It goes a step beyond anything we have done heretofore, in giving them control over both branches of their national assembly, subject to veto powers in the Governor General and in the President of the United States. Who is here to say that the conduct of the

Philippine people in the election of members to the lower house and the conduct of those members in the lower house has not been of such a character as to warrant us in now giving them the added right and the added responsibility of control of the upper body? That is really the question that is involved here. The preamble simply puts into words what is unquestionably the desire of the American people. Men may differ as to how you shall phrase it, men may like one form of language or another—

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. In just a moment. I take it there is no considerable number of men in America but that will admit that the purpose of this Government is to give ultimate independence to those people.

Now, I yield for a question.

Mr. FESS. As a lawyer, would you put a preamble in a legislative enactment?

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, I say to you that I am more concerned in giving voice to the determination of the American people that those people may know it is our determination than I am in the precedents of whether preambles should precede resolutions or bills. [Applause on the Democratic side.] There is something in this proposition more important than simply the question of whether you can find a precedent for a preamble in connection with a bill. And I, for my part, see no objection to that.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. MILLER. Has the gentleman any authority for the statement that this preamble does express the sentiment and views of the American people?

Mr. SHERLEY. I have no more authority than my own opinion, and it is the same authority that the gentleman would have in stating it did not express the opinion of the American people. On the other hand, I have no authority when I vote for a particular law for saying it is the expressed will of the country that that should be the law, but the responsibility is upon me and upon you as an individual lawmaker to interpret as best we can what we believe to be the determination and the desire of the people that we represent.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. It is also true that the American people commended the gentleman's party for inserting that particular thing in the platform?

Mr. MILLER. When? In 1900?

Mr. SHERLEY. I have no desire to be diverted from the really serious questions that are involved here into a dissertation as to whether one man or another is the best judge of the purposes of the American people. I assume, for the purpose of my speech, the belief that the American people do desire to see the Filipino people take their place among the nations of the earth, and, believing that, I legislate upon that assumption.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I was interested in the statement of the gentleman that he would not be in favor of putting the time in the bill at which independence should be granted. I would like to ask the gentleman if the Filipino people would not expect this bill to be followed up by a bill almost immediately giving them independence, and if this Government does not give it to them would it not be subjected to criticism that we have not acted in good faith by those people? Would we not be open to the charge of bad faith?

Mr. SHERLEY. That may be the expectation of the Filipino people. I can not control their expectations and their desires. My responsibility stops when I have undertaken conscientiously to perform as best I may the obligation that rests upon the people of the United States toward those people, and then, having performed it, I can only hope that they will accept it in the spirit that it is given and that it will prove to be as beneficial as those who propose it hope it may be.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman courteously yield for just one more question?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. MILLER. If this is a correct statement of the wishes and views of the American people, what on earth is the use of putting it into a bill?

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, well, the gentleman will understand that it is frequently well to not only give expression privately but officially of the attitude of the Government. You are dealing with a people far away from us, with a memory of a very tyrannical government that was imposed upon them. It is perfectly natural that there should be doubts and misgivings among them as to what is to be the real attitude of the American people. There are always those willing to stir men to a belief that the expressions of good will are really lip service and mean nothing. I grant you that simple expressions unaccompanied by deeds are of little avail in convincing any



people. But we are absolutely backing our statement as to intent by action that shows to them that what we have said is really what we mean. My own judgment is necessarily faulty, but I had some little experience in the Philippines, not sufficient to warrant me in having any conceited notion as to my superior ability to solve the problem that confronts them and us, but my own judgment, for what it may be worth, is that the real test of the capacity of the Filipinos to govern themselves will come when there have come to full maturity the children that are now being taught through the medium of public instruction the fundamentals of government and of real liberty. I do not think that time is yet at hand. I do not undertake to prophesy how soon it may be. We may have the delight of seeing it earlier than we anticipate, and we may have the regretful experience of seeing it postponed until long in the future.

But the only way we can actually find out the fact is by giving from time to time the chance to those people to so manage their affairs as to indicate whether or not they have learned the science of government. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 27 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, in closing the general debate upon this most important measure, a measure vitally affecting the interests of 9,000,000 of human beings, I trust I may be pardoned if I say that the majority members of the Committee on Insular Affairs are to be congratulated upon the fact that no Republican who has opposed its passage has assailed or even so much as criticized a single one of its many governmental or administrative features. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Considering the limited debate that was allowed on the bill, does the gentleman expect that in general debate we would take up the individual features of the bill?

Mr. JONES. "The gentleman" most certainly expected that those minority members of the Committee on Insular Affairs who subscribed to the minority report would have informed the House as to which, if any, of the governmental features of this bill they objected. This much, at least, it seems to him, they owed to their Republican colleagues, if not to the entire membership of the House. "The gentleman" further believes that the four hours of general debate allotted the minority afforded full opportunity for those speaking in opposition to the bill to have pointed out at least one of its features which in their opinion was objectionable or in any respect subject to just criticism. I repeat, therefore, that the Committee on Insular Affairs is to be congratulated upon having presented to the House a measure which, so far as this debate has developed, is free from Republican criticism. This is my reply to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman does not take up too much of my time, I will.

Mr. MANN. Oh, well; considering the fact of the gentleman's discourtesy, I do not care to proceed.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I will yield for a mere question.

Mr. MILLER. It is not for a mere question, but for something in the way of a statement. I think the opportunity ought to be granted for it.

Mr. JONES. No; I will not yield for a statement.

Mr. MILLER. Well, if the gentleman wants to make an assertion like that and then give no Member on this side an opportunity to deny it, all right.

Mr. JONES. There is no man on that side who can deny it. Everybody who has followed this debate knows that no Member on that side has undertaken to criticize a single governmental feature of this bill. The gentleman himself is about the only man who has referred to one of them, and his reference was to the provision relating to an elective senate; and even he expressed his approval of that feature. So, Mr. Chairman, my statement that no one who has spoken in opposition to this bill has undertaken to criticize a single one of its administrative features is literally true in every respect.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that its opponents have characterized the bill as a partisan measure. The ground upon which this assertion is based is that the preamble is in accord with the declarations of the last Democratic national convention as to the future political status of the Philippine Islands. If that constitutes it a partisan measure, then I am proud of the fact that it is a partisan measure.

But, Mr. Chairman, I can not understand how gentlemen can seriously contend that because the language employed in the preamble to this bill conforms substantially to that to be found in the Baltimore platform the bill itself is to be denounced as a partisan measure, and for that reason alone to be opposed by Republicans. The Republican platform of 1908 declared it to be the purpose of the Republican Party to give to the Philippine Islands, with certain restrictions and limitations, free trade between those islands and the United States; and a Republican Congress subsequently carried this party promise into effect. Would it have been logical, yea, would it have been honest, for Democrats, believing this concession to be just and right, to have refused to support it upon the sole ground that it was the fulfillment of a Republican promise, and therefore a partisan measure?

I take it, Mr. Chairman, that every political party that deserves the respect and support of its adherents will undertake, when afforded the opportunity, to carry into effect the pledges and the promises made to secure that support; and I do not hesitate to declare that were the Democratic Party to refuse, now that it has the power to do so, to write into the preamble to this bill what it wrote into the Baltimore platform upon the subject of Philippine independence it would deserve the execrations of all honest men. If, therefore, the Republicans in this House refuse their support to a measure the legislative features of which are unobjectionable to them solely upon the ground that the preamble to that bill is in accord with the platform promises of the Democratic Party, they are free to do so.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question right there?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. In the following section it is provided that no person shall be held to answer for a criminal offense without process of law. Is that sufficient to guarantee to those people the right of trial by jury?

Mr. JONES. I do not think so. The bill of rights in this bill does not impose upon the Philippine Government the duty of providing for jury trials. The Philippine Legislature, however, is fully empowered to do so, if in its judgment it is wise to do so.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is not a constitutional requirement, so to speak?

Mr. JONES. It is not a constitutional requirement.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the gentleman another question? I have only had opportunity to examine the bill to-day.

Mr. JONES. I will yield to the gentleman, but I would be glad if he would defer his question until we begin the consideration of the administrative features of the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. All right.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, nobody could have been more astonished, and certainly no one was more pained, than I was when on yesterday my genial and good friend from California [Mr. KAHN] charged in the speech which he then delivered that Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo and his associates actually sold out the liberties of their people to the Spanish for personal gain. This was a most serious charge against the most distinguished of Filipino patriots.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware that this grossly unjust and baseless accusation has often been made in the past by the enemies of Gen. Aguinaldo, but it has been so frequently and so completely refuted that I am astonished that any Member of this House would repeat so unsupported a charge. The gentleman not only made this charge, but he also stated that it was historically true, and when I ventured to challenge his statement, and called upon him to name a single reputable historian who had ever sanctioned it, his reply was that he could name one—Dean C. Worcester. Mr. Chairman, I have since then carefully examined Mr. Worcester's book. I have read everything that it contains upon this subject, and I can not find a line in it which justifies the statement made by the gentleman from California. Mr. Worcester himself says nothing that in the least reflects upon the conduct of Gen. Aguinaldo in connection with the transaction alluded to by the gentleman from California. He quotes at considerable length from a report made by an Army officer named Taylor, but there is not a word in that report that shows, or tends to show, that Gen. Aguinaldo ever appropriated this money to his own use, or that a dollar of it was ever used exclusively for his needs. Let me read from the report itself as quoted in the Worcester book:

From January 4 to April 4 Aguinaldo withdrew from the banks \$5,786.46 in part interest on the money he had deposited. This was used to pay the expenses of himself and his companions in Hongkong. These expenses were kept at a minimum; the money was drawn and spent by him. If one of the men with him needed a new pair of shoes, Aguinaldo paid for them; if another wanted a new coat, Aguinaldo bought it. Minute accounts were kept, which are on file among his papers,



and it is seen from them that his expenses were exceeding his income, which could only be \$12,000 a year, while he was living at the rate of \$22,000, with constant demands being made upon him by men who came from the Philippines. Life was not easy under these conditions.

Now let me read what is said upon this subject in other Philippine histories. I read from the work entitled "The Philippines—The War and the People," by Albert G. Robinson. This author says:

A special interest centers around the clause which relates to the money payment to be made by Spain to the participants in the insurrection. This has been made the basis of many representations, or misrepresentations, reflecting upon the honor and the sincerity of Señor Aguinaldo. He has been charged with seeking only his own ends, and with playing a shrewd game for the lining of his own pockets. He has been charged with "selling his country for Spanish gold."

Mark that this is the identical charge made by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] on yesterday—

The total amount payable was seventeen hundred thousand dollars Mexican silver—equivalent practically to one-half that sum in gold. But only \$400,000 Mexican of this was ever paid; and it is upon the receipt and alleged disposition of this amount that there rest the charges of greed and dishonesty on the part of Emilio Aguinaldo. The evidence in the case tends to show that Aguinaldo's conduct was wholly honorable and conscientious.

I now read from the work of Richard Brinsley Sheridan, an English author. He says:

Gen. Aguinaldo has been condemned by the Spaniards, the Americans, and other foreigners at Manila for having accepted these terms. He has been considered by his critics as a traitor to his people and a man without honor, who could be bought. But this opinion has only been formed by those who are ignorant of the man and of his character.

The reasons which induced him to enter into this treaty and put an end to the war which he was then waging against the Spaniards in Luzon was the promise that the concessions which he required for his people would be granted. Of the \$400,000 paid, two hundred thousand were deposited in the Hongkong & Shanghai Bank on the 3d of January, 1898, upon a fixed deposit for one year, and \$200,000 was paid into the Chartered Bank of India, Australia & China, at Hongkong.

Señor Buencamino, one of Gen. Aguinaldo's chief supporters, told me that such trust had they in Aguinaldo's honor and integrity that they desired the money should be deposited in Aguinaldo's own name. He also said that much as Aguinaldo required the money in his self-imposed exile, he did not draw for his own use a single cent of the deposited money.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I have already stated, my friend from California [Mr. KAHN] asserted that his statement was historically true. I have examined every history of the Philippines that I have been able to secure, and I can not find a word in any of them, including the Worcester book, that supports his charge. On the contrary, they all, with the exception of that book, which is silent upon the subject, characterize these reflections upon the character of Gen. Aguinaldo as absolutely without foundation in truth.

Mr. Chairman, the most striking incident in connection with this debate—perhaps I should say its most remarkable development—has been the extraordinary speech of the gentleman from Illinois, the Republican leader—

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit just a single word?

Mr. JONES. I will.

Mr. COOPER. I wish to say that these charges were made 12 years ago, and I investigated them as best I could at that time, and when I came to open the Philippine debate on the bill I refused to mention them in my speech at all. [Applause.]

Mr. JONES. I am very glad that the gentleman, who was at that time the very able chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs, and who reported the bill which is now the organic law of the Philippines, has had the frankness to rise and make that statement. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, as I began to say, the most remarkable occurrence of this debate was the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the Republican leader upon this floor. He seriously informed the House and the country that he had no doubt in his mind that as certain as that the sun would rise on the following morning a conflict would come between the Far East and the Far West across the Pacific Ocean. The history of the world, the gentleman declared, had taught us that the avoidance of this conflict was impossible. It is true he expressed the hope that it might only be a commercial conflict; but he added that "a fight for commercial supremacy in the end leads to a fight with arms, because," said he, "that is the final arbiter among nations." Therefore, for strategical and other reasons, the gentleman declared that he was opposed to giving the Philippine Islands independence now or at any time.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to say with all the emphasis I can command that even if I believed that the armed conflict which the distinguished leader of the Republican minority tells us is inevitable was not only unavoidable but even imminent, I could never give my consent to the permanent retention of the Philippines. On the contrary, if I believed, as the gentleman has declared that he does, that a struggle for commercial supremacy between the countries bordering on the Pacific Ocean will inevitably lead to an armed conflict between the Far East and

the Far West, I would not lose a moment in seeking to so amend this bill as to give to the Philippine Islands complete and immediate independence. I would do this because I wholly dissent from the conclusions of the gentleman from Illinois and because I believe now, as I have always believed, that, so far from the Philippines being a means of strength to the United States, they are a source of positive weakness, and that their retention is a constant menace, an ever-present danger, to the peace and welfare of the American people. That they are a source of weakness rather than of strength to us is not only my belief, but it is the oft-expressed opinion of competent military authorities, and that so well-informed and ordinarily well-poised a gentleman as the distinguished leader of his party upon this floor could hold the opinions he has expressed is nothing less than astounding to me. I do not agree with the gentleman that an armed conflict between the Far East and the Far West is inevitable. But if such a conflict shall ever come the provoking cause will be that the far-away Philippines constitute our most, if not our only, vulnerable point, rather than any question of mere trade rivalry.

Mr. Chairman, it may at least be said of the preamble to this bill that if it never answers any other good purpose its discussion has forced the Republican leader of the minority, amid the plaudits of his followers, into an admission which makes it clear that the present policy of his party in respect to the Philippines is not what it was declared to be by McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I congratulate the gentleman upon his frankness. His was at least an honest, candid, and courageous avowal.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. But, Mr. Chairman, in what sort of a position does it place the leadership of the Republican Party? In what sort of a position does it place the ranking Republican on the Committee on Insular Affairs, who has had charge of the Republican end of this debate? Where, too, does it leave the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], also a prominent Republican member of that committee, who, when interrogated as to his position by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], declined to say whether or not he favored granting the Filipinos their independence? It is pleasing to know that there is one prominent Republican who has the courage of his convictions and who is willing to tell the exact truth as to the position of his party upon this subject. Now I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, my colleague is not on the floor, and I do not understand that he made the statement which the gentleman from Virginia quotes him as making. I think the gentleman from Illinois expressed his individual opinion.

Mr. JONES. Oh, yes; but that is not very important, since the gentleman's individual opinions usually go with that side of the House. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I may add, too, that the opinions he expressed were warmly applauded by the Republican membership of the House. So that while what the gentleman said may have been but the expression of his individual opinions, it received the approval of his Republican associates, and the fact that he is the acknowledged leader of his party in this House will cause that statement to go forth throughout the land as the authoritative declaration of the Republican Party in respect to the Philippine Islands.

A MEMBER. It has gone out already.

Mr. JONES. Yes; it has gone all over the country. The Washington Post of this morning gave it a prominent place on its first page, a thing it has not done in respect to the proceedings of Congress, so far as I can recall, since the beginning of the European war. I am told, too, by gentlemen around me that the New York papers of to-day give to it a like prominence.

So, Mr. Chairman, I repeat, I am glad to know that there is one prominent Republican at least who has the honesty, the decency, and the frankness to tell the Filipino people the truth as to the position of his party upon this subject. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In a speech which President McKinley delivered in the city of Chicago he gave utterance to words which I commend to the gentleman who represents that city with such conspicuous ability in this House. In that speech President McKinley said:

The War with Spain was undertaken not that the United States should increase its territory, but that oppression at our very doors should be stopped. This noble sentiment—

He proceeded to say—

must continue to animate us, and we must give to the world the full demonstration of the sincerity of our purpose.

Are the Republicans, may I ask, who, under the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois, are opposing this bill upon the



sole ground that it declares it to be the purpose of the people of the United States to give the Filipinos their independence so soon as they have demonstrated their capacity to govern themselves by the establishment of a stable government, giving to the world the full demonstration of the sincerity of the purpose expressed by William McKinley?

Mr. Chairman, I regret that I have not the time in which to reply to the many misleading and too often wholly irrelevant statements made during this debate by gentlemen who oppose this bill.

I have already said, in regard to the assertion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] that only 15 per cent of the Filipinos were literate, that, on the contrary, at least 75 per cent of them, according to the best obtainable authority, were literate. The gentleman will doubtless recall that he said he made his statement upon the authority of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], but the speech of Mr. MILLER as it appears in the RECORD does not bear out that statement. This is what Mr. MILLER said, according to the RECORD, from which I read:

I said 85 per cent of the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands do not now have an adequate idea of what self-government is, its duties or responsibilities, or what independence really consists of.

It seems, therefore, that the gentleman from Ohio has not produced any evidence to corroborate his remarkable statement. The gentleman from Minnesota says he made no such statement. Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Not now. There is one other statement made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] to which I wish to call the attention of the House, notwithstanding that the Resident Commissioner from the Philippine Islands has already commented upon it. The gentleman from Ohio said in reply to a question by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox], as to what was the percentage of literacy in the American Colonies at the time of the American Revolution, that he could not give the exact figures, but that he could inform the gentleman that 29 of the 56 members who a few years later composed the Constitutional Convention were college-bred men, and that he knew of no fairer test of the literacy of that period than the fact stated by him afforded. Accepting his test as to the literacy of a people, I wish to inform him that every one of the 81 members of the Philippine Assembly is a college-bred man. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

During the course of this debate much credit has been claimed for the Republican Party for the public-school system established in the Philippines by the American Government. No one, I take it, will be disposed to deny that the public-school system inaugurated by Americans, but paid for by Filipinos, has proved a great blessing. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] was greatly mistaken, however, when he said that public schools taught by Filipino teachers were lacking in efficiency when removed from the immediate supervision of American educators. This was his statement:

I also wanted to see what was the result to the school of removing American supervision. So I traveled and I saw. I found that wherever American supervision was immediate, was direct, was there on the ground, the work of the teacher and the children and the school was efficient. It was what you might call satisfactory. The spirit was good. The morale was good. Things were shipshape. The atmosphere was such as you would like to see in a school. But, without a single exception, when you removed that immediate supervision and allowed a school in charge of a Filipino teacher to be removed and separated and to exist by itself the decline was immediate and most disheartening.

Oh, I visited so many of the schools that if they had not been named "schools" I would never have known that they were schools, because the supervision was not there, eloquently testifying to the capacity of the Filipino teachers to respond to the ideas that they see and to the utmost importance of the supervision and direction on the part of the American supervising force. This does not mean the Filipino teacher never can be self-reliant; it simply means that, while advancing, he has not yet reached it.

Now, let me read to the House what is said upon this subject by the director of education of the Philippine Islands in a special report bearing date January 23, 1914. Bear in mind, too, that the author of this report, which unquestionably contains the most accurate and trustworthy information obtainable in regard to the public schools of the Philippines, is not an appointee of the present administration. This is what this report says:

It has been the policy of the bureau of education to lay an increasing amount of responsibility upon the Filipino teacher. As a result, where five years ago there were 70 Filipino and 390 American supervising teachers, there are to-day 124 Filipino supervising teachers and 185 American. Moreover, there are a number of Filipinos assigned to work which is at least equal in importance and responsibility to that of the supervising teachers—there are now 29 Filipino provincial industrial supervisors—and this number will be constantly increased. There are at present 120 intermediate schools with Filipino principals. Five years ago there were 208 Filipino and 366 American teachers engaged in intermediate instruction. At the present time there are 430 Filipinos and 148 Americans. Primary instruction, except in a very

few classes where special work is being carried on, is entirely in the hands of Filipinos.

It would not be far from the truth to state that the school system as it existed seven years ago, with the exception of certain administrative offices, has been almost completely Filipinized.

Was ever a more responsive and conclusive reply made to any statement than is here made by the director of education to the derogatory and wholly gratuitous statement of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] has questioned the accuracy of my statement that the Filipinos favor the passage of this bill, and to show that such is not the case he read certain newspaper articles.

I not only declared that the Filipinos, with practical unanimity, desire that this bill shall be passed, but I submit that the evidence upon which I made that assertion is conclusive and overwhelming, the statements of a few interested, prejudiced, and Filipino-hating American newspaper writers to the contrary notwithstanding. I am perfectly aware that because this bill falls short of fixing a definite date for independence it is disappointing to a great many Filipinos, but the number of those who for that reason would like to see it fall of passage is so inconsiderable that it is absurd to say they truly represent the sentiment of the Filipino people.

This bill has not only received the indorsement of the Nationalista Party, which is the majority party in the islands, but resolutions of approval have been adopted by 8 provincial boards, 4 assemblies of municipal presidents, and 247 municipal councils. Out of 71 mass meetings where it was the subject of consideration and discussion, it received the indorsement of 70; and yet certain American newspapers published in Manila, saturated with a hatred of the Filipinos and bitterly hostile to even the thought of granting them independence now or hereafter, grossly exaggerate the importance of the action of a single mass meeting and willfully and deliberately misrepresent and malign the Filipino people as a whole.

This resolution, adopted by the municipal council of Gubat, is substantially in the language of those adopted by 246 other municipal councils:

THE MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT OF GUBAT SORSOGON, P. I.,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

EXCERPT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF GUBAT, HELD ON JULY 31, 1914.

By the suggestion of the president, the following resolution was enacted:

Whereas this municipal council has understood that the new Jones bill has been presented to Congress of the United States;

Whereas the Hon. WILLIAM A. JONES, Representative from Virginia, and as a faithful friend of the Filipinos, has framed said bill so that the Filipinos will in the near future have the entire control of the Philippine Government;

Whereas the council believe that the provisions of said bill are the most beneficial that the Filipinos can obtain from the Government of the United States at present, and that this will be the first step to a definite independence of the country;

Whereas the presentation of said bill to Congress was made, due to the energetic efforts of our Representatives in Congress, Hon. MANUEL QUEZON and Hon. MANUEL EARNshaw;

Whereas the Philippine Assembly, under the leadership of Hon. Sergio Osmeña, has always been the interpreter of the ideals of the Filipinos in this historical epoch of the country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this municipal council, following the unanimous feeling of the people of these islands in general, by means of this present resolution unanimously adhere to said bill, ratifying once more the faith in the patriotic labor of our Resident Commissioners in Washington and the Philippine Assembly; and be it

Resolved further, That copies of this resolution be sent to the author of the bill, WILLIAM A. JONES, the honorable Resident Commissioners, Philippine Assembly, and the assemblyman of the first district of Sorsogon.

Approved.

I hereby certify to the correctness of the above-quoted resolution.

MIGUEL ESCARCHA,  
Municipal Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, there are two municipal councils, it is true, that declined to indorse the bill, but they, together with the one mass meeting of which I have spoken, do not represent public sentiment in the Philippine Islands any more than one swallow makes a summer.

It has been said that no public hearings were had when this bill was under consideration in committee; that the Philippine Resident Commissioner [Mr. QUEZON] was not invited to appear before the committee, in order that he might give to it the benefit of his intimate knowledge of conditions in the Philippines.

It is quite true that the committee decided that no good could be accomplished by holding public hearings. This does not mean, however, that those who were charged with the responsibility of formulating this measure did not avail themselves of every means at their command to secure the best attainable information in respect to the various subjects dealt with in the bill. Naturally, then, Mr. QUEZON was among those most frequently conferred with, and I wish here and now to



publicly express the appreciation of the majority members of the committee for his many excellent suggestions and for the invaluable assistance which he in many ways rendered them. I consulted with him most freely as to each one of the more important provisions of the bill, and I wish to testify to my deep sense of obligation for all the intelligent and most helpful assistance which I personally received from him.

This bill does not express in its terms all that he may have desired and hoped for, but I am in a position to say that he accepts it as a definite and decided advance in the direction of a more autonomous government and of proximate and definite independence.

It gives to his people a legislature of their own choosing in both of its branches; it removes the odious restriction upon the right of suffrage, which denies to the Filipino who can not read and write a foreign language all participation in the civil affairs of his country; it enables the Filipinos to make their own laws and to raise and to expend the public revenues, and it provides for the early and thorough Filipinization of the civil service. But above and beyond all this it gives to them a definite promise that so soon as they shall have established a stable government they shall be granted their complete independence. It does not fix a definite date upon the arrival of which independence shall be granted, but it gives to this people a solemn promise and pledge that they shall have it, and it provides the easy means and marks the way whereby it may be secured.

No wonder, then, Mr. Chairman, that the brilliant representative of the Filipino people should have been moved to such impassioned eloquence when pleading with the membership of this House for the passage of this measure.

Mr. Chairman, the passage of this bill will mark the beginning of a new and a better era in the Philippine Islands. It will allay the discontent and remove the disaffection which has resulted from the failure of the United States hitherto to announce definitely and authoritatively their policy with reference to the future political status of the islands. It will inspire the Filipino people with lofty purpose and noble endeavor. It will incite in their hearts and minds the high purpose of demonstrating to the world their desire for national freedom and their capacity for self-government. And it will serve to cement into the strong bonds of enduring friendship that good will and kindly feeling which, thanks to the wise and sympathetic administration of Gov. Gen. Harrison, the Filipino people now entertain for the American Nation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired; all time has expired; and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk began reading the preamble.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. The Clerk is beginning to read the preamble. Does the consideration of the preamble precede the bill or the consideration of the bill precede the preamble in committee?

Mr. JONES. I do not object.

Mr. MANN. I am not asking the gentleman from Virginia whether he objects or not; I am making a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair.

Mr. JONES. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I thought the gentleman addressed his remark to me.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will permit me—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be glad to hear from the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, of course a preamble to a bill is not a very usual thing, and yet it is by no means unprecedented. I can not now give the Chair the page, but I think in volume 4 of Hinds' Precedents the Chair will find that when the bill providing for the Jamestown Exhibition, a bill and not a resolution, came before the House the bill was first considered and then the preamble was passed upon at the end of the bill.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I call the attention of the gentleman to Jefferson's Manual, page 160, paragraph 407, which I think settles the thing in the same way.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I think so.

Mr. MANN. I know that the parliamentary clerk was of the same opinion.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I desire to suggest this in addition to what I was saying: A few days ago we had a bill here which had a preamble, and that bill was considered in Committee of the Whole. I had the honor to be presiding at that time, and this question arose privately, the Chair being asked by the Clerk, and the Chair directed the Clerk to read the

preamble at the beginning. No question was raised and no amendments to the preamble were offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Tennessee familiar with the provision in Jefferson's Manual referred to by the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I am fairly familiar with it. Here is the only difficulty about that: As I remember that statement, that deals with procedure in the House, and we are proceeding in the committee.

Mr. MANN. This deals with procedure in the committee. It reads in this way:

To this natural order of beginning at the beginning there is a single exception found in parliamentary usage. When a bill is taken up in committee or on its second reading they postpone the preamble until the other parts of the bill are gone through.

That seems to be conclusive.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I thought that referred to the procedure in the House.

Mr. MANN. It refers to both procedure in committee and in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to the Chair that that is conclusive, and the Clerk will read the bill.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, before the reading is commenced I desire to make this suggestion: We desire to make a motion to strike out the preamble, and, of course, we desire to debate that motion. Either that debate will have to be had now or it will have to be had at the close of the reading of the bill, and, I presume, would have to be had in the Committee of the Whole. In the last bill considered I made a motion to strike out the preamble to the bill, but it could not be debated at that time, and if we wait until the bill has been finished in the Committee of the Whole there will be no opportunity for discussion of the preamble.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I think he is mistaken in that. After the reading of the bill in the Committee of the Whole, then the preamble will be read and will be subject to amendment, just the same as the rest of the bill, to be reported to the House, and in the House, under the procedure, the disposition of the preamble comes after the engrossment of the bill and before the third reading of the bill, according to the precedents.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is my understanding, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANN. The question would be, I take it, on agreeing to the preamble.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes; and after the bill has been concluded under the five-minute rule, then the preamble will be read and be subject to debate and amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding of the Chair. The Clerk will read.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. Gordon having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Carr, one of its clerks, announced that Mr. PITTMAN had been relieved from further service as a conferee on the bill (H. R. 14233) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, and Mr. SMITH of Arizona had been appointed in his stead.

#### THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the provisions of this act and the name "The Philippines" as used in this act shall apply to and include the Philippine Islands ceded to the United States Government by the treaty of peace concluded between the United States and Spain on the 11th day of April, 1899, the boundaries of which are set forth in article 3 of said treaty, together with those islands embraced in the treaty between Spain and the United States concluded at Washington on the 7th day of November, 1900.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have just listened with a good deal of pleasure and profit to the speech of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES], and I was especially attracted to that portion of his speech in which he said that the Republican leader on this side of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], had fairly and honestly stated the position of the Republican minority, and he congratulated him upon his frankness. I wish that the distinguished gentleman from Virginia would now show the same frankness and state the position of his party upon this question. I wish that the distinguished gentleman would rise in his place and say that he is in favor of Filipino independence or that he is opposed to it, in order that we may know where his party stands. I have been listening here now for several days to the different speeches made upon that side of the House, and I have not yet heard anyone say what his position was.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him a moment?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. If the gentleman had done me the honor to listen to me yesterday, he would have heard it, I think.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I did hear some of it; but I will ask the gentleman now whether he is in favor of independence for the Filipinos?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Absolutely.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. When?

Mr. SLAYDEN. As quickly as it can be done. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Oh, yes; "as quickly as it can be done."

Mr. SLAYDEN. I am ready now.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Is your party ready now?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I regret to say that not being in control of the party I can not answer that. Is the gentleman opposed to giving the Filipinos independence?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Absolutely.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Now and always?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. JONES. Does the gentleman ask me that question?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, my reply is that from the day the Philippines came into the possession of the United States up to the present moment I have accepted the teachings of Thomas Jefferson, and followed the mandates of my party upon this subject, and therefore I will state that I believe that the Filipinos are entitled to their independence and that it ought to be given them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GOOD. When?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That is no answer. That is the same statement that we have heard over and over again, but I am looking for some man upon the Democratic side of the House who has the courage and frankness that the gentleman from Virginia attributes to the leader on this side of the House.

Mr. JONES rose.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Oh, I can not yield any more unless the gentleman yields me five minutes.

Mr. JONES. I have no time to yield, but I have no doubt that the House will consent to allow the gentleman to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Then I will ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended for five minutes in order that the gentleman may ask me a question.

Mr. JONES. Oh, no; the gentleman was to ask me a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Oh, no. I did ask the gentleman the question, and he attempted to answer it, and traveled around the same circle that all the rest of them have traveled.

Mr. JONES. Oh, no. I will answer any question that the gentleman desires to submit.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Let the gentleman do it in his own time, and let him answer this question: Whether when he drew this preamble he was doing it for political effect or whether he meant what he said; and if he meant what he said, that the Filipinos should have independence, why did not he write it in the bill?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I—

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Oh, I say that the gentleman should answer it in his own time.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I will state now that I regard that question as insulting.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If the gentleman is so easily insulted as that, perhaps I will insult him again before I sit down. If it is an insult to ask the chairman of this great committee where he stands upon the most vital question—

Mr. JONES. Oh, no.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Then I admit that I am guilty of using insulting language.

Mr. JONES. Your question conveyed an intimation that I regarded as insulting.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman professes—

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If I were to yield to the gentleman, he would simply travel around in that circle once more, just as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] trav-

eled around. Now, what you gentlemen seek to do is to impress the country with the idea that you are in favor of Filipino independence, but you have not got the courage to say so. You have not got the courage to put it in your bill; you have not got the courage to do anything but attempt to play politics. Now, I am not condemning you gentlemen if you are in favor of Filipino independence. Perhaps you are right; I am not prepared to say you are not; that is certainly a legitimate subject of debate; but we have them, and since we have them I do not want to turn them loose to become the prey of the other nations of the world. But what I am criticizing you gentlemen for, what I am condemning you for, is because you have not the courage of your convictions. You constantly talk about Filipino independence; you make beautiful speeches about liberty for all and self-government, but you do not have the courage to put it in your bill. That is what I am complaining about. Why do not you have the courage to say where you stand? Why does not the gentleman from Virginia do like the gentleman from Illinois? Let us fight out this question on the square.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] offers an amendment as a new section, as section 2.

Mr. TOWNER. But, Mr. Chairman, section 2 has not been read.

Mr. MANN. I wish to offer an amendment to section 1.

Mr. BURGESS. Let the amendment be read.

Mr. MANN. But we have not passed section 1 yet. I understand this amendment comes after section 1.

Mr. BURGESS. Yes; it is a new section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from Illinois wishes to offer an amendment to section 1?

Mr. MANN. Yes; I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. That amendment has been offered.

Mr. MANN. Then I wish to oppose it. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia one question. Section 1 of the bill refers to the treaty of peace concluded between the United States and Spain on the 11th day of April, 1899, while section 2 of the bill refers to the provisions of the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain signed at Paris, December 10, 1898. Why the discrimination in name? It is the same treaty, is it not?

Mr. JONES. It is the same treaty. One section speaks of the date at which it was signed and the other the date at which the exchange of the ratifications was made. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that these sections, except in one slight particular, are exact copies of the organic law, or rather that the first section is an exact copy of the organic law, and the second a copy of an act of Congress subsequently passed. In other words, the present law is reenacted.

Mr. MANN. Well, it may be that Congress described this same treaty in two different ways in two different acts, which is not desirable, and even less desirable to describe the same document by a different description as to the treaty in two sections, one following the other in the same act. I do not care which it is, but it seems to me if we refer to the treaty of Paris we ought to describe it by the same date, whichever it is to be. Any person reading this would suppose you have reference to two different treaties, if they were not acquainted with the history, because you give two entirely different descriptions to the same document.

Mr. JONES. Well, I will say to the gentleman that this is the same treaty, and that the 11th of April, 1899, is the date on which the ratifications of the treaty were exchanged at Washington. The treaty was signed in Paris on the 10th of December, 1898.

Mr. MANN. I am aware of that fact.

Mr. JONES. There can not possibly be any confusion, because it is one and the same treaty, and there are no other treaties with which it could be confused. These sections are copies of the language used in the organic act and the act of Congress passed subsequent thereto.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman quotes from two different acts of Congress without reflecting upon it at all. A parliamentary body referring to the same document in the same act ought to refer to it so people who are not acquainted with the history of the facts may understand it. I will guarantee there are not 20 Members of this House who read these two items who would know without stopping to think for a while whether it referred to the same document.

Mr. JONES. Well, Mr. Chairman, they do, and therefore I do not think any harm can result. It may be entirely true, as the gentleman says, that without explanation Members here might not know, but it is not possible that there can ever be any serious contention over the matter.



Mr. MANN. I made the inquiry with the idea that possibly the gentleman might change one or the other, so as to use the same description in both places.

Mr. JONES. I think it would be best to let it stand as the law is now.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER. I understood from the statement of the Chair a moment ago that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas was to the second paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a substitute to the section following section 1.

Mr. MILLER. I desire to make a motion with reference to paragraph 1 that is in the bill. Would that of necessity come before the motion to introduce a new section?

The CHAIRMAN. To section 1?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; to section 1.

The CHAIRMAN. That would have precedence.

Mr. MILLER. I have no desire to displace the gentleman from Texas unless I lose my right by so doing.

Mr. BURGESS. That is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to offer an amendment to section 1?

Mr. MILLER. I desire to move to strike out, after the word "treaty," in line 9, the remainder of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 9, after the word "treaty," strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I am frank to express at the outset I do not expect the committee to adopt the amendment, and I doubt very much if I myself would vote for it standing by itself. However, there is a very particular and important reason why I have offered the amendment.

An amendment of some such character should be so framed and adopted in the bill as to exclude from many of the provisions of the bill, and particularly from the operation of the preamble, if that is to be adopted, a portion of the territory which we bought from Spain two years after we concluded the treaty with Spain ending the Spanish-American War. The attention of the committee was yesterday invited by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Young] to the situation in respect to certain of these islands that I desire again to call the attention of the committee to, and perhaps to emphasize. There is a wide difference between the extent of the territory which we bought and paid for by the treaty we made with Spain in 1900 and the territory which we acquired by reason of the treaty of Paris in 1898. The territory, however, which we acquired by the last treaty and which we bought is exceedingly small, wholly unimportant to the Filipino people, wholly unimportant to the Philippine Islands as an entity, if they are ever to be independent, but vitally important to certain considerations which I think are important to the American people. Now, the islands which we acquired by that last treaty with Spain was that little group of islands called Cagayan de Sulu, in the midst of the Jolo Sea—a little group of islands almost down to Borneo, in the southernmost corner of the archipelago. Now, there is no advantage to us or anybody to retain this group of small islands, and we should not do it, and that is the reason why my amendment should be adopted, but there is reason why Cagayan de Sulu should be retained by the American Government for the American people. As is evident by a glance at the map, it is a very small and unimportant group of islands. It is inhabited, not by what we ordinarily call Filipinos but by a handful of people who are all Moros, and those Moros asked that they be retained as a part of the United States. Now, if any of you desire to give to a people that sovereignty which they ask for, and which you say they have a right to demand, then their voice should be heard. But that is not the real and more important feature that I want to impress upon the committee.

As stated by the gentleman from North Dakota yesterday, on the greater of these islands—of Cagayan de Sulu—is one of the most remarkable formations to be found anywhere in the world. I made a special trip there at the suggestion of a prominent official who desired to know what the situation exactly was, because he had heard of it and knew something about it. As you reach from the south this particular island you will find the coral reefs there as elsewhere, but when you land and get ashore you find to your amazement that just inside of a complete breakwater there is a circular body of water, a harbor that is at least 200 feet deep at every point and as deep in some places, probably, as a thousand feet right up to the shore, and all of salt water. A channel into this can be made with a very small expenditure of money, because

it is only necessary to go through coral rock. But that of itself is not so remarkable. This lake is about 3 miles in circumference; but to my surprise I found that on the innermost part of it—that part toward the interior of the island, where the cliffs rise from 200 to 250 feet straight up perpendicularly—there was a break, almost a chasm, and on the other side was another lake, almost equal in area, and so deep that we were not able to find bottom anywhere. The circumference of this second lake, I should say, was about 4 miles, and the water is absolutely fresh; and this is the remarkable situation. The two lakes are separated by a perpendicular cliff 250 feet high and probably not exceeding 75 feet in width, excepting at the point where this natural chasm leads through. The inner lake is 15 feet higher than the outer or salt-water lake, requiring simply the construction of one small lock to enable boats of any size or magnitude to pass from the sea directly into a magnificent deep-water harbor of fresh water. The like of that is not to be found anywhere else in the Orient or anywhere in that half portion of the world's surface. The people of maritime experience will readily appreciate the great value in that situation to any commercial nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for three minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. By the construction of a lock that deep-water harbor is available to the boats of the world, if we wish to make it so; but it is certainly available to our own.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Why would they go there?

Mr. MILLER. To get the barnacles taken from the boats. It is a most ideal place, almost the only place in the Orient where a condition like that exists.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the committee as to the distance this natural harbor is from some of the leading ports of the Orient?

Mr. MILLER. Of course Manila is the leading Philippine port of the Orient, and the distance between the two is about 600 miles; and I will say also that it is almost on a direct line; it is quite on a direct line of all the steamboat lines now from Japan and upper China to Australia and New Zealand. The route passes right down through here, touching at Zamboanga, and then on down. When the Panama Canal is constructed everybody knows, at least I think all are agreed, that one of the great routes of travel of the world will probably bisect the Philippine Islands, and, passing through, go to regions farther to the west and come within a reasonable distance of this group of islands.

Mr. JONES. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. JONES. What island are these lakes on?

Mr. MILLER. Cagayan de Sulu.

Mr. JONES. They were embraced in the original lines laid down in the treaty of the 11th of April.

Mr. MILLER. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but it has not been so considered by the authority of our Government.

Mr. JONES. The lines are on the maps.

Mr. MILLER. I do not wish to enter into a controversy about that now, but they are specifically mentioned in the treaty we made with Spain in 1900. But there is another feature perhaps more important. Whether the Philippine Islands are to continue as a part of the United States or not, the United States expects to have trade relations with the Orient, and for that purpose we must have a naval base.

The Democratic majority on this side have specifically stated, and wisely, in their platform that whatever may be done respecting the removal of our sovereignty from the islands we shall reserve in the islands appropriate regions as a naval base, and among those certainly we should reserve the Cagayan de Sulu. There is a perfect harbor, in which we can place all the warships now under the American flag, where they can have a safe rendezvous, where they can enjoy the priceless privilege of having barnacles removed, and where they will be relatively free from attack. And I will say further that the periphery of the inner harbor, while not wide as distances go, is yet so high and so perfect that it is a reasonably safe protection from the outside.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it does seem to me that we ought to be advised as to this condition, and that we ought to govern ourselves accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point that there is no quorum present.



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ten Members are present—a quorum. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] will proceed.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for one question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. GOULDEN. How near the lines of traffic between the United States and the Orient is that island of which the gentleman was speaking?

Mr. MILLER. The island I am speaking of is really very distant from the lines of traffic between the United States and the Orient. The main line of traffic which our boats and really all the boats sailing the Pacific now take is the great circle to the north, and then they come around, striking Japan, and then down south, striking Hongkong, several hundred miles to the southwest, and then on to Manila. There is another route to the south, striking the middle of the Philippine group at the straits just to the south of Luzon, and then passing on to Manila.

Mr. GOULDEN. What is the population of those islands?

Mr. MILLER. I journeyed around through the interior, but I do not suppose there are a hundred people in all the group.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman indicate what the United States Government paid Spain for the islands it took over under the treaty of 1900?

Mr. MILLER. I have not refreshed my recollection lately, but I think it was \$100,000. Twenty million dollars was paid for the Philippine Islands and \$100,000 for the group.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak to the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes.

Mr. MOORE. I ask the gentleman from Minnesota to hold his place and answer a question in my time, if he will.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized to oppose the amendment.

Mr. MOORE. No; I am for the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] may have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will put that question now, and recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] afterwards. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. MOORE. As I understand the gentleman, the United States paid a consideration for those islands in the Sulu Sea, to which the gentleman has just made reference?

Mr. MILLER. It did.

Mr. MOORE. Under a treaty which had nothing to do with the original taking of the islands?

Mr. MILLER. None whatever.

Mr. MOORE. Therefore we own those islands in fee to-day?

Mr. MILLER. We do.

Mr. MOORE. By virtue of a title ceded to us by Spain for a consideration?

Mr. MILLER. We do.

Mr. MOORE. And it is proposed by this bill to give those islands back to the Filipinos; that is to say, if we take the preamble for the substance of the bill?

Mr. MILLER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. MOORE. Under that arrangement we would give away lands that have nothing whatever to do with Filipino independence?

Mr. MILLER. That is so.

Mr. MOORE. Property belonging to the United States and available, as the gentleman indicates, for a ship-repair station or for coaling-station purposes, in excellence as to fresh water beyond that of any other point in the whole archipelago?

Mr. MILLER. That is true.

Mr. MOORE. Is the gentleman going to use the remainder of his five minutes?

Mr. MILLER. No; I believe I have nothing further to say.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman has traveled over the Philippines. Does he know of any point in those islands that would

be more suitable for a ship-repair station or a docking station or a coaling station than those islands, owned absolutely in fee by the United States?

Mr. MILLER. In answer to that, Mr. Chairman, I will say that there are many other points in the islands that would be more accessible than this little group of islands, but none of them possesses the priceless qualification of having a fresh-water harbor.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman hold his place for a moment longer while I make a statement?

Mr. MILLER. I will.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington rose.

Mr. MOORE. I wish to say that a fresh-water station is one of the most desirable things that the Navy can possess. There are very few fresh-water stations along any of the coasts of the United States. There is none serviceable for the Navy on the Pacific coast with the single exception of Mare Island, and that is somewhat in dispute. There is no fresh-water naval station along the whole Atlantic seaboard now available for naval vessels except at Philadelphia, up the Delaware River. Hence it is apparent that if we give away what this cry for independence does not require, lands or islands that we actually possess in fee in the Philippine Archipelago, where at some future time such a station might be sorely needed, we will simply be yielding something that perhaps the necessities of the United States dictate we should hold for ourselves.

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MILLER. I will yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] first.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I wanted to ask the gentleman some questions about these islands. On the Pacific coast we are naturally interested in this subject of naval stations. What are the conditions about the entrance in rough weather? Are the conditions such that in time of storm naval vessels could enter this harbor?

Mr. MILLER. I will say that that is in the typhoon belt, and at certain seasons of the year typhoons are found in that region, although not with the severity that characterizes other portions. But you will observe that it is in the center of the Sulu Sea, and at most seasons of the year the storms are not bad and do not make a difficult situation at all. But at any time, even in stress of weather, during a typhoon, with a proper entrance into this outer harbor, I can see no reason why any boat should not make it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That is the point I wanted to ask about.

Mr. MILLER. Now I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM].

Mr. HELM. If I understood the gentleman from Minnesota correctly, he says that the Government of the United States paid \$100,000 for the islands he has indicated as being in the Sulu Sea.

Mr. MILLER. For these and the other group I have mentioned.

Mr. HELM. Is it not a fact that the \$100,000 was paid for the islands north of Luzon and south of Formosa, in between Japan and the Philippine Islands?

Mr. MILLER. I concede that there is a matter of contention about names, but not possessed of merit.

Now, the Cagayan de Sulu Islands, possessing this peculiar formation which I have indicated, naturally are likely to attract a great deal of attention from the commercial nations of the world.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I very greatly regret that I did not hear the first part of the gentleman's argument in favor of his amendment. Has the gentleman considered the military necessity concerning this point he talks of?

Mr. MILLER. That was the original cause of my visit to the islands, to ascertain some facts bearing on the military situation.

Mr. BUTLER. Has the gentleman in mind what it will cost to defend this position from the land side?

Mr. MILLER. There is no expense in defending it from the land side. The island is so small that from the center you can see the water all around it.

Mr. BUTLER. Have the military men ever suggested this as a desirable point?

Mr. MILLER. They have. The highest official in that department requested that I go there, which I did.

Mr. BUTLER. Has the Navy Department made any expression about it?



Mr. MILLER. I have not had an opportunity to confer with the Navy Department.

Mr. BUTLER. I know the gentleman has been in the Philippine Islands, where I have never been and never expect to be and never want to be, and because he has been there I am asking him for this information. I know that at one time we had concluded to stop at Olongapo, and then I know, after we had expended some of our money there, it was decided that that was not a desirable place.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Has any naval authority ever recommended the establishment of a coaling or naval station at any other point in the whole Philippine Archipelago except in the vicinity of Manila Bay?

Mr. MILLER. I think not. I do not think this point would make an ideal place for a coaling station, anyhow. What I desire to call to the attention of the committee is the peculiar characteristic of this one harbor and its availability for an important purpose, both for the Navy and for commerce.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield further at that point?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The chief advantage, as I understand, of this remarkable formation is that it will afford us the advantages of a dry dock for the purpose of cleaning the bottoms of vessels, without going to the great expense of constructing such a dry dock.

Mr. MILLER. Yes. Now, in reference to what the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] stated, which was reiterated by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM], about these islands not being included, they will find that by the last treaty we made with Spain the Sulu Islands are specifically named. Now, there are no Sulus up in the north. The Sulus are in the south. Whether the word "Cagayan" is to be confined to this group of which I am speaking or is also to be extended to the group up north there may be some controversy, but there can be none about Sulu. I will say that the word "Cagayan" is used both in respect to the northern region of Luzon and also with respect to these islands.

Now, it may be interesting to the membership of the committee to ascertain how it comes that there are these two twin lakes right side by side. Anybody who looks can see that they are the craters of two extinct volcanoes, side by side.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] has told us a good many interesting things about the island of Cagayan, and it seems that he possesses a great deal of information in respect to it; but, unfortunately for him, the island to which he refers and the possibilities of which he has discussed came into the possession of the United States under the treaty of Paris, and is not one of those named in the subsequent treaty, which was negotiated in 1900. I think if the gentleman will do me the honor to come here and examine this map I can show him conclusively that he is absolutely mistaken, and that every statement he has made falls to the ground because his statements of fact are not correct.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. JONES. It has been said that it is better not to know so many things than to know so many that are not so.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. JONES. I will; but if the gentleman will come here, I think I can convince him of his error.

Mr. MILLER. I want to say now that the gentleman can not do it.

Mr. JONES. I think I can if the gentleman is honest, as I believe him to be.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman's misinformation about the Philippine Islands could not convince a 10-year-old baby.

Mr. JONES. Very well, Mr. Chairman; let us see whether or not I convince him. I have in my hand a copy of the treaty as it appears in the speech of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Young] made on yesterday. It reads:

Spain relinquishes to the United States all title and claim to title which she may have had at the time of the conclusion of the treaty of peace of Paris to any and all islands belonging to the Philippine Archipelago—

Mark the words—

lying outside the lines described in article 3 of that treaty, and particularly to the islands of Cagayan, Sulu, and Sibutu and their dependencies, and agrees that all such islands shall be comprehended in the cession of the archipelago as fully as if they had been expressly included within those lines.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is the line laid down in the Paris treaty. It comes down here and then runs across in this direction. Now, any of the islands of the Philippine Archipelago that are not within these lines are ceded to the United States under the treaty of 1900. The gentleman says the treaty especially mentions the island of Cagayan. The gentleman is

mistaken about that. The treaty says the island of Cagayan Sulu, and if the gentleman will come here I will point out to him on the map the name Cagayan Sulu, as plain as it can be printed. It is situated just here. It is Cagayan Sulu that is mentioned in the treaty, and not Cagayan Island. Now, will the gentleman admit his mistake?

Mr. MILLER. No; because in the treaty there is a comma between the word Cagayan and the word Sulu. If the gentleman does not wear glasses that will enable him to see punctuation marks, I can not help it.

Mr. JONES. I notice that there is a comma there in the treaty as it appears in the speech of the gentleman, but on this map there is Cagayan Sulu and Cagayan. The island of Cagayan is near the center of the archipelago and could not possibly have been alluded to in this treaty. So the gentleman is absolutely mistaken, and if he will not admit it I can not help it, but I think every man in this House, including the membership on that side, will admit that the gentleman from Minnesota is mistaken.

Now, I wish to say that, even if I were mistaken in assuming that the gentleman would admit his error, I feel sure that he will do so later on and in his cooler moments. I do not blame him, or, rather, I should say that I can understand how the gentleman would not wish to admit that the statements upon which he founded his argument were incorrect—that he was arguing from false premises. This section simply defines the territory that is embraced in the term "the Philippine Islands." Gentlemen speak of our having what they call a fee simple title to the islands embraced in the treaty of 1900, and say that it is different from the title under which the others are held. That is absolutely untrue. We got the whole Philippine group by paying \$20,000,000 for it. It was discovered afterwards that, according to the lines laid down in the treaty, a few small islands of very little importance, with very few people on them, were excluded. In order to acquire title to them all, since Spain did not wish to retain these few islands, President McKinley entered into an arrangement by which we were to get them all, whether embraced within the original lines or not, for the sum of \$100,000. So we hold them all by exactly the same title. But if we did not, I can see no reason why the language objected to should be stricken out, since there is nothing in the bill which proposes to dispose of the Philippine Islands. When the time comes, if it ever does come, and I hope it will come soon, when the United States shall grant the Filipinos their independence, they will do so on their own terms and will doubtless reserve such coaling and naval stations and terminals for cables as they may wish to retain. I am confident that no one of them will ever be located on the insignificant little island of Cagayan Sulu.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORTON. I desire to ask the gentleman if this part of the treaty quoted by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Young] yesterday, appearing on page 17478 of the Record, is a correct transcript of that part of the treaty?

Mr. JONES. I do not believe that the punctuation is correct, but I have no copy of the treaty and can not answer the gentleman's question more definitely. But I can say that the War Department, which has jurisdiction over the Philippines, has always regarded the island of Cagayan Sulu as the one specially mentioned. It was specially mentioned because it was so near the line that it was deemed best to do so, I suppose.

Mr. NORTON. The transcript of the treaty on page 17478 reads "Cagayan," then a comma is inserted, and follows the words, "Sulu and Sibutu." Will the gentleman tell the House where the island of Sibutu is?

Mr. JONES. It is so small that I have not been able to locate it on the map. There are 3,000 or more of these islands, and some of them are so small that they have not been put on the map.

Mr. NORTON. Does the gentleman think the treaty of 1900 refers by name to two or three islands?

Mr. JONES. I think it refers to two. I feel absolutely certain as to this, and I think the gentleman himself must admit as much.

Mr. NORTON. Why should one conclude that was the intention if the treaty reads as quoted in the Record?

Mr. JONES. Because the island of Sulu, or Jolo, where the Sultan of Sulu resides, is a comparatively large and populous



island. It is a very important island. It has always been understood by everybody that that was embraced in the original treaty, and there is no other Sulu Island but that.

Mr. NORTON. Is there not an island known as Sulu Island and another island known as Cagayan Island?

Mr. JONES. There is Cagayan and Cagayan Sulu and Sulu. Sulu is a very large and populous island, where the Sultan of Sulu resides.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I will.

Mr. COOPER. Was the island of Cagayan included in the terms of the first treaty of Paris?

Mr. JONES. Of course it was. It is in the very center of the group.

Mr. COOPER. Then it is excluded from the second treaty?

Mr. JONES. Of course.

Mr. COOPER. Then it leaves the island of Cagayan Sulu as the one included in the second treaty?

Mr. JONES. Of course. Everybody understands it except the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman. I am informed by gentlemen who are examining the map that the map itself states that Cagayan Sulu is referred to in the second treaty.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is marked on the map as having been acquired by the subsequent treaty.

The CHAIRMAN. The debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield for me to make a request to close debate in 10 minutes?

Mr. MILLER. I will, but I may not occupy more than three minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close on this amendment in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the committee, I think I can clear up the situation in a word. The gentleman from Virginia takes issue with me from the fact that I claimed that the group of islands to which I have referred are the ones we acquired by the last treaty with Spain, and he claims that they were acquired under the first treaty. There are a great many places and islands in the Philippine group that have the name Cagayan. There are many separate islands that have the name Sulu. There is a lot of confusion resulting from a repetition of these names. The treaty which we made the last time reads as follows:

And particularly to the islands Cagayan Sulu and Sibutu and their dependencies.

Mr. Chairman, no matter how you construe the language, whether it be this group to which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Jones] referred as the Cagayan de Sulu group or the group to which I referred, Cagayan Sulu, they were both included within the wording of the treaty. Both names refer to the islands called Cagayan, inhabited by Moros, and their dependencies. The Cagayan Sulu group is the only one named Cagayan and containing Moros in that region. I will call the attention of the committee to the fact that in the best atlas, prepared by the able Father Alge, which is the foundation of most of the maps published since, aside from those which were prepared by the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the group I have described was called not Cagayan or Sulu, but Cagayan de Sulu or Jolo. It is the contention of the War Department that this group that I have described is in the same position as this group down here called Sibutu. They are inhabited by Sulus, and they were not included in that first treaty. It does not matter which you claim is the parent group, the language of the treaty is "Cagayan Sulu and Sibutu and their dependencies." Sibutu is in the most extreme part of the Philippines, almost down to the Equator. I went down there. It is not in the same situation as these others, except that it is included in the last treaty. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Jones], I am sure, does not wish to state that the island where the Sultan of Sulu lives is called the island of Sulu. It is the island of Jolo.

Mr. JONES. I asserted that it is sometimes called Sulu and sometimes Jolo.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman has stated it right.

Mr. JONES. That is what I stated before.

Mr. MILLER. Then, he can not complain if I have given him an opportunity to restate it.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I will ask the gentleman if it is not true that the Mohammedan Group of Islands, of which the island now known as Jolo is one, was not called the Sulu Group?

Mr. MILLER. There were several groups down there, and their names shifted more or less, but the general name usually applied to all those islands was Sulu Group, as the gentleman suggests.

Mr. TOWNER. Let me call the gentleman's attention to this fact, that the island as platted is called Cagayan Jolo, and then following, in parenthesis, is the word "Sulu," to indicate, as I understand it, that it belongs to the Sulu Group.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. In reading the remarks of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Young] as they appear in the Record of yesterday, I find that in that portion of the treaty which he quoted in the Record a comma appears between the words "Cagayan" and "Sulu."

Mr. MILLER. There is a comma in the copy put in the Record yesterday.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is evidently a mistake, because in the Senate document from which the gentleman has just read I find that "Cagayan Sulu" is all one name.

Mr. MILLER. That is true; and I do not know which is correct. It has no bearing on this, however. There is a comma in one and not in the other, but it does not matter. The point we have to admit is this, that these are two groups of islands inhabited by Moros which we purchased from Spain, and I do not care what names you call them by. We bought them in 1900, and the War Department—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the bill by adding the following as a new section, to follow section 1:

"That it is the purpose of the United States to cease exercising sovereignty over the Philippine Islands as soon as may be with justice to them and honor to the United States, and that it is the preference of the United States to accomplish this purpose by establishing an independent government in said islands; that in pursuance of such purpose and preference the President is respectfully requested to consider the expediency of opening negotiations with the Governments of Great Britain, Germany, France, Russia, Spain, and such other Governments as he may think advisable, with a view of effecting a joint treaty with such Governments, by which it shall be provided that an independent government in the Philippine Islands, when established by the United States, shall be recognized and preserved; that pending the establishment of such independent Philippine government the Philippine Islands shall be neutral territory; that such Philippine government, when established, shall agree that it will maintain equality of trade relations toward all the signatory powers, and that in the event of war between any of the nations of the earth it shall be neutral; that such concessions as may be made by the United States in the establishment of such independent government shall be recognized by all the signatory powers."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on that.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I will call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that this is an important matter, and it occurs to me that there ought to be some agreement as to a time for debate.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, a point of order has been reserved. I desire to make the point of order that it is not germane. If the gentleman from Texas desires to discuss it, I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. BURGESS. No; I will ask the gentleman to proceed and make the point of order now.

Mr. JONES. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. BURGESS. Five minutes.

Mr. JONES. I will reserve it.

Mr. BURGESS. But I do not care to make a speech if it is not in order. Let the gentleman make the point of order.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, in order to accommodate everybody, I will make the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman to reserve that point of order until I can ask the gentleman from Texas a question.

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas is not germane to the bill.

Mr. OGLESBY. Germane to the bill or germane to the preamble?

The CHAIRMAN. Germane to the bill.

Mr. JONES. It is not offered to the preamble.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.



Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss seriously this proposition with all the Members here. I do not offer this amendment for buncombe. I am serious about it. I drew and introduced into this House substantially that resolution in 1904, and I made a speech at great length—in fact, the longest speech I ever made in the House—upon the proposition on January 9, 1906. That was in advance of any platform favoring the neutralization of the islands, and the resolution was introduced some time before anyone else suggested the neutralization of the islands. So that I am in a position to claim credit for that; but, frankly, that is immaterial. I would not care for it. I would not be here now urging it, except I am fully of the opinion that it is the wisest thing for the Filipino people and the United States combined to vote this into the body of the bill.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. I have just read the gentleman's amendment, although I carefully listened to it being read, and it seems to me the gentleman has struck the kernel of the whole situation. The gentleman proposes immediate action—

Mr. BURGESS. That is what I propose.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman proposes that the President shall be authorized at once to proceed to confer with the great nations of the world as to the neutralization of those islands, looking to our ultimately yielding up our sovereignty over there. That is what the gentleman proposes.

Mr. BURGESS. It may interest you to give you a little reminiscence of a personal matter about this. I was first a candidate for Congress in 1900. I went down to Galveston and went into the office of Kleburg—whose brother was in Congress, and a very brilliant lawyer—and he said to me, "Burgess, what about your Philippine platform in 1900—

"We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to give the Filipinos, first, a stable form of government; second, independence; and, third, protection from outside interference, such as has been given for nearly a century to the Republics of Central and South America—

"What do you say to that plank?"

Mr. MADDEN. That would be an extension of the Monroe doctrine to the Philippines.

Mr. BURGESS. I said, "That involves a misconception of the Monroe doctrine, a misapplication of it to the Eastern Hemisphere, and I will not support that." He rose and shook hands with me and said, "I thought you had some sense; I am for you for Congress." He had supported a Republican two years before. That put me on my mettle, and it put me to studying this question; and I evolved after writing and rewriting—this resolution was drawn at least 50 times, and finally I introduced it into the House, and I stand on it now as the best and most practical solution of the Philippine question that is possible to mortal man. I believe that thoroughly or I would not be here urging it now. And I find myself in fine company in that belief.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Has the belief of the gentleman from Texas in the sacredness of promises of neutrality changed in the last two months?

Mr. BURGESS. No, sir.

Mr. BUTLER. He is still persuaded that nations beginning to fight will preserve what has been termed a "paper contract"—

Mr. BURGESS. Just a moment there. Neutrality will be very much stronger now than ever before.

Mr. BUTLER. Provided disarmament comes; yes, sir.

Mr. BURGESS. It will be stronger than ever before, and there is more reason for the adoption of this resolution now than there ever was.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I take it that the gentleman does not think that the party promise would be made good unless his amendment is incorporated into this bill?

Mr. BURGESS. Well, I think that. I have a letter here which I want to read. This is from a great man and a great Democrat, and you all love him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BURGESS. I desire to read this letter:

JANUARY 28, 1914.

MY DEAR BURGESS: I remember well your speech on the Philippine resolution in January, 1906, and was very favorably impressed then, and subsequent study has brought the fixed conviction that your resolution is the solution of the problem. It ought to be passed, as it not only accords with the last Democratic platform, but is based on the soundest and wisest principles.

Your friend,

CHAMP CLARK.

[Applause.]

Now, if you will take the four platforms you will see the Democratic Party has stumbled—

Mr. SLOAN. It usually does.

Mr. BURGESS. But I love it in that it stumbles toward the right. It makes mistakes, but it makes those mistakes toward the right. In the Democratic platform of 1904 it said:

We insist that we ought to do for the Filipinos what we have done already for the Cubans, and it is our duty to make that promise now and upon suitable guaranties of protection to citizens of our own and other countries resident there.

That was the point that stuck in my craw. What protection would the Filipino have in person or property if we adopted the scuttle policy, took away our fleet, and declared their independence and sailed away? They would be worse off than to go on—

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I did not fully understand the gentleman's amendment. Does it contemplate that the United States shall guarantee that the neutrality of the Philippines be preserved?

Mr. BURGESS. No, sir.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does it simply mean, then, that the United States itself will agree to respect their neutrality?

Mr. BURGESS. In this joint treaty, all the nations agreeing.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. What does that amount to?

Mr. BURGESS. And upon that we will give them independence whenever we think they are entitled to it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Who is going to enforce that neutrality?

Mr. BURGESS. Who is going to enforce law anywhere?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. But there is always a power, I will state to my friend.

Mr. BURGESS. We have had neutrality treaties for 100 years and very few have been violated. Switzerland to-day is subject to a treaty involving neutrality, and that neutrality has not been violated up to this hour, when the worst war in the history of the world is going on around her.

Mr. BUTLER. But the gentleman knows an army can not very well get into Switzerland and—

Mr. BURGESS. And it will be pretty hard to get around to the Philippines.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURGESS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Suppose a rebellion should begin in the Philippine Islands under the neutrality proposed by the gentleman from Texas, who would put down the rebellion?

Mr. BURGESS. All the powers who signed the neutrality treaty. That is the explanation.

Mr. STANLEY. Would any internecine strife in the Philippines affect their neutrality so far as trouble between foreign nations is concerned, or affect us in any way?

Mr. BURGESS. I do not think so.

Mr. HELM. Will the gentleman from Texas explain how it will be possible for anything except a sovereign or an independent government to enter into a compact of neutralization? Does not the whole proposition presuppose or presume that a territory to be neutralized must of itself be an independent government and a sovereign and a party to that compact or contract of neutralization? How can one sovereign, how can the United States, contract for the sovereignty of any other territory other than with the consent of the government of the territory to be neutralized, and how can it consent except that it be a sovereign body?

Mr. BURGESS. There is no proposition of that sort in my resolution.

Mr. HELM. Your proposition here is to neutralize the Philippine Islands, which is not a sovereign country—

Mr. McKELLAR. That can be taken care of in the treaty.

Mr. HELM. And it can not be done.

Mr. BURGESS. I disagree with the gentleman about that. Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman, of course, is sincere in his amendment and believes in the independence that is brought



about in this way; then does not it follow that the gentleman is opposed to giving the Philippine Islands independence until all these nations will agree to give neutralization?

Mr. BURGESS. That does not follow.

Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman believes in independence without it?

Mr. BURGESS. Let me say that I am a Democrat. I believe in the American theory of self-government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Texas be extended 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELM. Will the gentleman yield for just one further question?

Mr. BURGESS. In just a moment. Let me answer this gentleman first. I will say to the gentleman from Washington I am a Democrat, and therefore believe in local self-government. I believe that colonies are inimical to this country, and if we do not keep them out it will result in destroying this Republic. I feel very strongly on that line. I would take anything I could get, even an intimation, which I think is here, although it is simply a "whereas" and has not very much strength—it is not in the bill—and if my amendment is voted down, I am frank to say that I will vote for the bill. That is my answer to that question.

Now, I was reading these platforms. The Democratic platform of 1908 says:

We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us as we guarantee the independence of Cuba until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers. In recognizing the independence of the Philippines our Government should retain such land as may be necessary for coaling stations and naval bases.

That was in the Democratic platform of 1908, and was the first reference to neutralization by treaty. My resolution was introduced four years before. The Democratic platform of 1912 says:

We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers.

Now, I think it was drawn hastily. It was over at the Baltimore convention. I think my resolution is substantially in accord with that resolution, with that plank in the platform. What does it propose? It proposes to the Philippines, "Here is your chance to get independence. We will try to negotiate a treaty, and if that is negotiated all your troubles will disappear as if by magic." You know and I know that the Filipino people will be more capable of maintaining a separate government when protected by a treaty of neutralization than it would otherwise, and that is the first step, in my judgment, that ought to be taken in any party action. We ought to provide for the neutralization by treaty of the islands. It is all well enough to talk about independence. It is all well enough to preach about the glories of the freeman, and so forth; but how are you going to give them independence? That is the question, and my resolution strikes at the heart of the matter. I submit it to every honest, thoughtful man. It is the best solution I can think of or that perhaps you can think of. If you have a better one, I am ready to accept it.

Mr. FALCONER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. FALCONER. You just remarked that your resolution conformed to the intention of the plank of the Democratic platform. I would like to ask the gentleman if this bill also conforms to the platform?

Mr. BURGESS. As far as it goes, it does. But there is nothing in this bill as it is presented to you about neutralizing the islands.

Mr. GILLET. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. GILLET. I understand that your amendment suggests that we should give them independence when they are fitted for it. Does the gentleman think that will be in the immediate future?

Mr. BURGESS. I think so. In other words, that is my idea.

Mr. GILLET. Will you fix the date at which you think they will be fitted for it?

Mr. BURGESS. That is simply my idea. If we can negotiate a treaty of neutrality, I think that will prove an immense impetus toward freedom for the Filipinos.

I think they will be ready to take on a government of their own and run it much quicker in that way than in any other way, and I think if they go on progressing as they have been doing for the past 14 years it will not be more than 10 or 15 years before they can be given absolute independence, predicated on a neutral treaty. That is my view of it.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does not the gentleman think it would be a very great mistake to give the Filipino people their independence without having such treaties as the gentleman mentions in his resolution previously entered into?

Mr. BURGESS. I do.

Mr. McKENZIE. And does not the gentleman believe that he has his proposition reversed? Ought we not first to have the treaties and then independence, rather than independence and the treaties later?

Mr. BURGESS. If the gentleman will notice my resolution, he will see that it says that it is the purpose of the United States to cease exercising sovereignty in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. MOORE. But it does not indicate that that time has now arrived?

Mr. BURGESS. No; it does not; nor does any other platform.

Mr. MOORE. Suppose, then, as some of us fear, that the impression should go abroad in the Philippine Islands that we have granted them independence by the passage of this bill, and one island should bear upon another island, or a more powerful people should fall upon a weaker people. The gentleman would still have a saving clause in his resolution by exercising a protectorate over the archipelago?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. In other words, the gentleman would prevent the islands from running amuck in the event of independence being granted to them at any time?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, referring to the speech I made in 1906, I want to recite a passage to show that my resolution is in accord with precedents. I read:

On February 28, 1823, the House passed by an aye-and-no vote of 131 ayes to 9 noes the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to enter upon and prosecute from time to time such negotiations with the Federal maritime powers of Europe and America as he may deem expedient for the effectual abolition of the African slave trade and its ultimate denunciation as piracy under the laws of nations by the consent of the civilized world."

This resolution was offered in the House by Mr. Mercer, of Virginia. An examination of the debate in the House not only shows no objection to the method by any Member of the House, but a general recognition of the duty of Congress to declare the will of the people for the guidance of the Executive is observed in all the discussions, Mr. Wright, of Maryland, voicing that idea in these words:

"Sir, this Congress ought to take upon themselves the responsibility of this measure by their positive opinion and leave it no longer a subject of doubt what is the will of the American people."

On December 23, 1823, Mr. Livingston, of Louisiana, offered the House a resolution that—

"The President of the United States be requested to negotiate with the Government of Great Britain for the cession of so much land on the island of Abaco as may be necessary for the erection of light-houses, etc."

This was adopted without debate or objection. Henry Clay was Speaker; Daniel Webster and many great names in our history were Members. On May 16, 1826, on motion of Mr. Livingston, a resolution was agreed to that—

"The President of the United States be requested to inform this House whether any arrangement had been made with the Government of Great Britain in consequence of the resolution of this House of the 23d of December, 1823."

Verily, in those days the House asserted itself. In his message of December 3, 1833, President Jackson says:

"I have the satisfaction to inform you that a negotiation which, by desire of the House of Representatives, was opened some years ago with the British Government for the erection of lighthouses on the Bahamas has been successful."

And then follows a whole lot more.

Now, that is all I have to say. I believe that this resolution, if put in the form of a law, will bind the American people; that is, the form in which I offer it as an amendment. It has two advantages over the preamble. In the first place, it is not a preamble, but in the body of the law it is substantive law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman desire more time?



Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas have two minutes in which to finish his statement.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CLINE). The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] may proceed for two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Second, it provides for neutralization in accord with the platform, in accord with the theory of turning the Philippines loose, free.

Now, I submit, this question must come up. Of course if a man takes the view that my friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN] does—and I know he takes it honestly—he will vote against anything that looks to Philippine independence. But, on the other hand, the man who believes that the Filipinos ought to be granted their independence ought to vote for the most sensible thing to give it to them. That is the difference; and if this resolution is in line with your thought and commends itself to your judgment, I hope you will adopt it. I will follow, if it is adopted, by a motion to strike out the preamble. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am well aware of the great thought which my friend from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] has given to this question. The amendment which he offers is an exact copy of a resolution introduced by him in 1904 originally and which has been reintroduced at each succeeding Congress and has been before the Committee on Insular Affairs ever since I have been a member of the committee. I am in a large measure in sympathy with part of the sentiment of the resolution; but I respectfully submit to the membership of the House that it has no place at this point or at any other point in this bill. This bill which we are now considering—not the preamble—is an affirmative declaration of positive law, providing for an enlargement of the power of the people of the Philippine Islands in the government there and has no reference, so far as the bill is concerned, to the foreign relations of this Government and other Governments as regards the Philippine Islands or any other territory in the world. This proposition of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] is to take a joint resolution simply requesting the President to do a thing which he already has the authority to do without the legislation and putting it into the vital part of an organic act dealing with the government of those people by themselves. This resolution undertakes to deal with foreign relations of the United States. The bill simply provides for the government of the Philippine people.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman states that the bill is merely an organic act providing for the government of the Philippines; but has the gentleman noticed the title to the bill, which reads:

A bill to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes; that has reference to the preamble. I am speaking now of the bill itself.

Mr. BRYAN. Then, the title given here does not refer to the bill, but to the preamble, which is not a part of the bill?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The title refers both to the preamble and the bill.

Mr. BRYAN. But still the preamble is not a part of the bill. This amendment, fixing the political status of the Philippines, would come under the title of the act, would it not?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The Chair has already held that it is germane. I am not making any question about that. I am simply saying that it is out of line with the theory on which the bill is drawn, entirely. I am speaking now of the bill, not the preamble. The bill provides for the enlargement of the Government of the Philippine people by themselves. The resolution which the gentleman offers as an amendment provides for dealing with international relations by the United States.

Mr. BRYAN. Then does it not follow that if this amendment is not proper after this title, the preamble is out of place after the title?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not think so; and when the time comes I shall discuss the preamble. I do not care to enter into a discussion of it now. If this matter was standing here alone, if this were offered as a substitute for the bill, I do not mean to say I would favor it now in either respect, but there would at least be some logic in that. But to offer it as a vital part of the law which is being enacted is improper. It has no place in this bill. So far as practical action may come in the future, if this bill shall be enacted, when the time comes the President of the United States can, without any act of

Congress, open negotiations looking to neutralization; or if that should not be done by the President, and the Congress should in the future deem it wise that that should be done, it could easily pass a resolution suggesting that course to the President; but certainly the gentleman would not desire to place in the legislative part of the bill a proposition dealing with international relations.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] begins I would like to have leave to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If my time has not expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the gentleman's time will be extended two minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why is not this Burgess resolution just as pertinent to this bill as the preamble which is on it now?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if it were in proper form offered as an amendment to the preamble, I would not undertake to say that it was not pertinent to that, although it contains a direction, while the preamble only contains a recitation; but it is offered as an independent section, section 14, to the legislative part of the bill. You do not want to say by an enactment of law that it is the preference of the United States to do so and so.

Mr. BURGESS. Why not?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. You do not pass a law to say that. That applies to resolutions, not to legislation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the gentleman will permit, of course I do not know the exact processes of the mind of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS], although I am remarkably well acquainted with him; but I take it that the reason he offered his resolution as section 14 to this bill is that under parliamentary practice we do not get to the preamble until we get through with the bill. My own judgment about it is that as a parliamentary proposition it would come in as a substitute for the preamble; but it would be like locking the barn door after the horse is gone; and the gentleman has given notice that he proposes to strike out the preamble if his amendment goes in. So that it is practically offered as a substitute for the preamble.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Of course I take it that the House would not desire—certainly this side of the House would not desire—to strike out the preamble to this bill, even if this were inserted. I have not taken that up, because I thought it would be proper to take that up later. Let it be borne in mind that this amendment, however, contains a direction; the preamble to the bill is merely recitative.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As far as the preamble goes, it looks in the same direction that the resolution of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] looks.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Precisely; that is true; and the only thought that is in the resolution that is not in the preamble is this suggestion of neutralization; and in view of the fact that we are not now fixing any date, there will be abundant time later, under better conditions of world-wide interest, for the question of neutralization to be taken up and considered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. If this Congress sees fit to pass a resolution on this subject, why is not this Congress just as competent to pass upon the question as any future Congress at some future time?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Well, Mr. Chairman, I certainly would not reflect upon the competency of this Congress—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Tennessee be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks that the time of the gentleman from Tennessee be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, in answer to my colleague, I will say that the committee has prepared this bill in the light of existing conditions. The question of neutralization belongs to the treaty-making power of the Government. It is within the authority of Congress, and it is no violation of the proprieties for the Congress to pass a resolution request-



ing or suggesting to the executive powers the idea of entering into negotiations looking toward neutralization. But upon the theory upon which this bill is drawn and because there is no fixed date, why the necessity of taking up the question of neutralization and enacting it into legislation under the world-wide conditions which now exist?

Mr. BURGESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. With pleasure.

Mr. BURGESS. In both the Democratic national platforms there is a demand for neutralization, and without any time limit.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes, that is true; I am familiar with that fact. But I repeat again, because I hope the House will get clearly the thought I have in mind about this, that most assuredly the House will not desire to put into the legislative part of this bill, simply creating an organic law for the Philippine Islands, a proposition that deals with the international relations on the part of the Government of the United States.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will yield.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think it is more important in dealing with the Filipinos to consider form than substance?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is an abstract matter.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman says, as a matter of form, it ought not to go in; as a matter of substance, we might put in anything. I want to ask the gentleman which is the more important, to preserve the form or miss the substance?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman asks an abstract question. I have stated my position as clearly as I could state it. I think the gentleman from Illinois would agree with me in the proposition if he had not something else on his mind.

Mr. MANN. I have so often been taken to task myself for endeavoring to preserve form as well as substance, and the gentleman's arguments seem to be directed toward the form, that I wanted to know whether he thought the form should be maintained at the sacrifice of substance.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I have never taken the gentleman from Illinois to task for that.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. STEENERSON. I would like to have the gentleman tell us where in the preamble there is any declaration of policy or intention of the United States as to the Philippines. The title says:

To declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

The first and second clauses of the preamble relate to the past intentions of the United States, and the third clause simply says that it is desirable for the speedy accomplishment of that purpose to give the Philippines such control of local affairs as is not inconsistent with our sovereignty. There is no positive declaration in the preamble as to the intention of the United States as to the future of the Philippines. Why is it left to inference?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I am not discussing the preamble; I was discussing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STEENERSON. I would like an answer from the gentleman.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I was not discussing the preamble. The gentleman possibly was not in the Hall at the time the preamble was passed over for consideration at the end of the bill.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to present to the committee more fully the thought that I presented a while ago. The Philippine Islands are not sovereign. They are a dependency of the United States. They are not a nation among nations. For the like reason that an infant can not make a valid contract a people that do not constitute a sovereignty in themselves, that have no power to act for themselves in their own interest or in their own behalf, can not enter into a compact or a treaty.

The amendment presented by the gentleman from Texas predicates the sovereignty of the Philippines, and necessarily is the sequence of a treaty assented to by the Philippines. I ask the gentleman from Texas if the Philippine Islands could to-day make a treaty?

Mr. BURGESS. That is altogether beside the issue.

Mr. HELM. Will the gentleman answer that question yes or no?

Mr. BURGESS. I want to ask the gentleman from Kentucky a question.

Mr. HELM. Can the Philippine Islands enter into a valid treaty?

Mr. BURGESS. No. Now will the gentleman answer my question? Can not all other countries enter into an agreement to neutralize the Philippine Islands?

Mr. HELM. My position is that they can not; and I will explain why they can not. Such an amendment as is offered by the gentleman from Texas presents and carries with it the idea of the capacity of the Philippines to enter into a treaty. Now, where the committee is liable to be led into an error is this: Neutrality is an act voluntarily entered into on the part of those authorized to act for the territory that is proposed to be neutralized. The United States is a sovereignty; and the Congress of the United States is authorized and can act for it through its treaty-making power under its Constitution. It can enforce its contracts or treaties with other nations. The Constitution of the United States is not in force in the Philippines. It is the one place where the Constitution does not follow the flag. On the other hand, the Philippines have a law-making body of their own, but with limited power. Nations that possess the power—the might—to make another territory do its will, do it by force, and neutralization by force is unthinkable and impossible. But when you come to enter into such an arrangement as the amendment of the gentleman from Texas proposes, it presupposes a condition or state on the part of the Philippine Archipelago as a sovereignty to agree to it or else it is not neutralized. If they can not make or agree to a treaty of neutralization and consent to it, they can not ratify it; and how can they ratify it unless they are a sovereign nation? Therefore I say that the resolution of the gentleman from Texas at this time is not in order.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HELM. Yes.

Mr. QUIN. How can you make them sovereign so that they would have the power?

Mr. HELM. Whenever the United States, which holds and exercises sovereignty over the Philippine Islands, declares them free and independent as a sovereignty, then they are in position to enter into a treaty of neutralization. I challenge any Member on this floor to cite me to the country that has been neutralized which was not at the time of that act sovereign in itself.

Mr. FALCONER. How does a Territory come into the Union?

Mr. HELM. By act of Congress.

Mr. DAVENPORT. And the Congress creates it a sovereignty.

Mr. HELM. It is as simple as A, B, C. Let the gentleman rise on the floor and tell me what country, what territory, was ever neutralized that at the time of its neutralization was not in itself a sovereign entity?

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HELM. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Does not this resolution undertake to do two things at once?

Mr. HELM. It is not a question of what it undertakes to do, but what the Filipinos have the right to do. How can you make a valid contract with a party who is not competent to make the contract?

Mr. FESS. I think the gentleman should wait until I ask the question before he attempts to answer it. This resolution looks to the sovereignty and neutralization of the islands at the same time, does it not?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It occurs to me that this amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] is a wise provision, if anything like this is to be the policy of the Government.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. No; I have not the time. Divine providence has given to every nation and every people enough intelligence to govern itself, although often few of the members of a particular nation or people are capable of self-government. Only in this sense are the Philippines capable of self-government, and only in that sense would one of the Southern States, where there is a majority of negro population, if every male person were permitted to vote and have his vote honestly counted, be capable of self-government. [Applause.] The Philippine Islands will be capable of self-government with the restrictions placed on suffrage by this bill, which provides, first, those who hold office; second, those who are educated; and, third, those who have property. That is confined alone to the Filipino proper, and I think in this the committee was wise. Certainly in all ages and in every government history discloses the necessity of limitation upon suffrage, just as it has been done in the

South, and as this bill proposes for the Philippines; and as the population grows denser and social evils more threatening the greater that necessity. So the committee was wise in this particular. But let us see where we are drifting. I want to say that I heard with great pleasure and profit the speech made yesterday by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and if I had not been surprised heretofore at the gentleman's learning I would have thought that he got that speech from one that I put into the RECORD on "Mexico and Asiatic menace." [Laughter.] Certainly it is far wiser either to hold to the Philippines or to give them unrestricted independence. Believing that the Filipinos are not capable of self-government, in the sense that all of them can exercise the ballot, or any great number of them, I see no strength, military or otherwise, in holding the Philippines. Besides, blood is thicker than water, and in the economic struggle to come, with the military struggle that is surely to follow in the awakening of the Asiatic nations, we are not going to have them as our allies. Therefore we ought not to be committed to the policy of giving them independence and defending them without some provision like this amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I have not the time. If we "neutralize" that territory by a compact with other nations, it relieves us from such responsibility, and I repeat again, that we ought not to be compelled to exercise a Monroe doctrine over the Philippine Islands. Men may profess faith in the people of those islands to govern themselves. Why, gentlemen seem to forget that as between the Philippine Commissioner on this floor, who is an intelligent man, and the Negritos, the tree dwellers, the head-hunters, and those who live now in a nude condition there is no comparison. Why this Government was compelled to take steps to prevent the Christian Filipinos from robbing the non-Christian Filipinos; and when you find, as you do there, a population of the negro race far below the intellectual possibilities, to say nothing of the physical capabilities, of the negro of the South, you can never hope to make of them a self-sustaining, self-governing population; and I am surprised at any Democrat who would advocate such a policy, especially if he be from the South, where we have disqualified the negro with the grandfather clause. Then, the head-hunters and that class on the other islands will in the end prove to be the prey of the more intelligent ones. I repeat again, certainly the Philippine Islands are capable of self-government if only the intelligent class rules, as is provided for in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. We have a representative of that class on the floor of this House, but he could not claim to be a fair, low-average representative of the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands. He is even among the shrewdest of the wisest tribe, one of the philosophers, sir, of that island, and under this bill they will, as they ought, control the islands. But we certainly ought to take one or the other of two positions, either that we will keep the Philippines or that we will turn them loose by such method as will not compel us to defend them, because as sure as fate, the economic struggle between the white race on this continent and the Asiatic races will follow in the awakening of that great giant, China, of whom Napoleon said years ago, "Let him sleep; do not wake him." But, Mr. Chairman, we have awakened him, and with the awakening he will demand economic advantages and put us to our mettle.

History discloses that the great wars of the world have been fought for the most part either over race supremacy or an economic struggle, which is the basis of the gigantic struggle now going on in Europe, and you have a combination of race and economic necessity of the Asiatics pitted against us; and when that time comes, unless we hold the Filipinos in absolute subjection, they will be against us, and if we turn them loose, with the Monroe doctrine over them, they will immediately begin treaty making with Japan and other nations to which they are closely allied that will involve us in a war which the shrewdness of Japanese statesmen would seek to bring upon us through the Filipinos.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Do I understand that the gentleman would make the question of withdrawing sovereignty over the Filipinos by the United States depend upon the abil-

ity of the United States to negotiate treaties of neutralization with all the great powers of the world?

Mr. MURRAY. No; but I would try that first. Personally, if the gentleman desires my view, I would try that plan, and if we get that plan we will certainly have the open-door policy in the Philippines. That would certainly make it neutral territory. Having failed, I would turn them loose, sell them, and endeavor to get rid of them forever, that we may never be called upon to engage in a war to protect their independence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I want to ask this additional question, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. MURRAY. Very well.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman does not understand that there is anything whatever in this bill as reported from the committee which in any way commits this Government to the extension of the so-called Monroe doctrine over the Philippine Islands?

Mr. MURRAY. It does in the preamble, coupled with the policy declared in the preamble; with the power of local self-government in the second preamble it certainly does.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. After independence is granted and all sovereignty withdrawn?

Mr. MURRAY. It certainly does. If you refer to the second preamble, it says it was not our intention to withdraw that sovereignty.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It says it has been the purpose of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and recognize their independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein.

Mr. MURRAY. Then would it not be wiser to get a "neutralization" of the territory through the other great nations than to turn it loose?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, that may be; I am not able to—

Mr. MURRAY. Does the gentleman for a moment believe—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. But the power exists already. The gentleman surely does not understand that the adoption of this amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas virtually destroys the integrity of this bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Why, certainly it does not.

Mr. GORDON. That is the reason the Republicans are for it; that is plain enough.

Mr. MURRAY. Well, sometimes Republicans can be right and sometimes Democrats are wrong. [Applause on the Republican side.] I want to say there are Democrats for this the same as there are Republicans for this, and it certainly ought to be good Democratic doctrine, because it is in line with our party's declaration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I would be just as much opposed as the gentleman from Oklahoma can possibly be to any bill granting to the Filipinos immediate independence, or independence at any time in the future, which would not free the United States from all responsibility on their account forever thereafter. The gentleman is entirely mistaken if he thinks that this bill contemplates the assumption by the United States of any responsibility for the Philippines after they are given independence. This bill proposes to give to the Filipinos their independence when a stable government has been established by them. When such a government has been established and they are given independence the United States is to withdraw from the islands for all time. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not think gentlemen understand the situation. During the Sixty-second Congress a bill was reported from the Committee on Insular Affairs which provided that the Filipinos should be given their independence upon a certain definite date fixed in that bill. There accompanied that bill a resolution which was introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], and which was also reported to this House, requesting the President to endeavor to secure for the Philippines a neutralization agreement.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That resolution was substantially the resolution of the gentleman.

Mr. JONES. Substantially the resolution of the gentleman, and I may say that it is the purpose of the Committee on



Insular Affairs to report that, or some similar resolution, to this House so soon as it seems feasible to do so. It will embody the idea contained in the Burgess resolution. As this bill fixes no date upon which the Filipinos shall be given their independence, the committee did not believe that it was expedient to report such a resolution at this time. In the first place, owing to the greatly disturbed conditions of Europe, it would not be possible to secure consideration for any neutralization agreement at this time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the Members of the House realize the true character of this resolution. If they do, I feel sure they will not vote for it. I do not believe that any gentleman on this side understanding it will vote for it, nor do I believe that any gentleman on that side will support it if he realizes what is in it. Do you realize, gentlemen, that this resolution provides that upon its adoption the Philippine Islands shall become neutral territory? That is, whether this neutralization proposition materializes or not, the Philippine Islands are to become neutral territory upon the adoption of the resolution which the gentleman from Texas proposes.

Mr. BURGESS. Just a moment; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. JONES. I think I am not mistaken.

Mr. BURGESS. Oh, yes.

Mr. JONES. I will read the exact language of the resolution.

Mr. BURGESS. Read it.

Mr. JONES. "That upon the establishment of such independent Philippine government"—

Mr. BURGESS. Go back and read—

Mr. JONES (continuing). "The Philippine Islands shall be neutral territory." The establishment of the independent government is to follow the neutralization for which the gentleman's resolution provides.

Mr. BURGESS. Just a moment. I know the gentleman does not want to misrepresent me.

Mr. JONES. I certainly do not.

Mr. BURGESS. And I know he is doing it. The resolution provides for the negotiation of a treaty by which certain things are to be done.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. BURGESS. And has reference back to that part. It does not mean to declare that it shall be neutral. The gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. JONES. Let me read the resolution. It speaks for itself. It says:

That in pursuance of such purpose and preference the President is respectfully requested to consider the expediency of opening negotiations with the Governments of Great Britain, Germany—

And so forth. The President is "respectfully requested to consider the expediency" of it. He is not directed to do so at all, although if this amendment shall become a part of this bill it will be an enactment of law. He is merely requested to consider the expediency of opening such negotiations—

Mr. BURGESS. That is the language of all such resolutions.

Mr. JONES (continuing)—

With the view of effecting a joint treaty with such Governments, by which it shall be provided that an independent government in the Philippine Islands, when established by the United States—

That is, established at some future time—

shall be recognized and preserved.

But it adds—

Mr. BURGESS. There is no "but" there.

Mr. JONES (continuing). That this proposed independent government of the Philippine Islands shall be neutral territory.

There is no other construction to be placed upon it. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Insular Affairs has always realized that these two propositions should be embodied in two different measures. The President should not be directed in a bill to endeavor to secure the neutralization of the Philippines, but requested in a joint resolution to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Jones] has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, may I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. I think that nobody on that side of the House can favor this proposition. This belief is founded upon the fact that it is a more radical proposition, according to its author, than that embodied in the preamble to this bill. The gentleman from Texas has frankly told the House that if he can not get his more radical proposition he will support the less radical one embodied in the preamble to the bill. He thinks the Filipinos would secure their independence sooner under his resolution. I think nobody on this side of the House will want to

emasculate this bill in the way proposed by the gentleman from Texas.

As my colleague, Mr. GARRETT, has said, the Committee on Insular Affairs has given a great deal of consideration to this measure. It has certainly given a great deal of consideration to the preamble. It has always favored the presentation to this House of a resolution requesting the President to negotiate a treaty of neutrality with reference to the Philippine Islands if it was possible to do so. But the committee has not reported that resolution to this House as yet, because it did not deem that there was any pressing necessity for it. The committee believes that that resolution can be presented, and it hopes there will be little or no opposition to its passage after this bill has been disposed of. The bill provides for no definite date for independence. Everybody must acknowledge that under the provisions of this bill independence can not take place until the Filipinos have demonstrated their capacity for self-government and until the Congress of the United States, recognizing that fact, passes another measure giving them their independence. When that time comes or when it approaches it is the intention of the Committee on Insular Affairs to report a resolution of neutrality embodying substantially what is in this resolution. I hope that no gentleman who believes in proceeding decently and in order in this legislation will vote for the resolution.

It is suggested by somebody on this side that the Republicans will vote for it simply in order to make the bill appear preposterous. He may be right; but I shall not believe it until gentlemen on that side, who have expressed so much opposition to the preamble to the bill, go on record as voting for a resolution which, according to its author, goes a bowshot further in the direction of early independence than does the preamble itself.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, the pending measure has a preamble followed by an enacting clause, and this enacting clause is followed by the several sections of the bill which it is proposed to enact into law. Every law passed by the Congress of the United States contains an enacting clause in these words:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—*

and whatever follows that enacting clause is supposed to be the law. Of course, lawyers and laymen know that the ordinary definition of a law is that it is a rule of action. A law commands, or prohibits, or authorizes, or directs. But here it is proposed to put after the enacting clause these words:

The President is respectfully requested to consider the expediency of opening negotiations, etc.

So that if Congress should adopt the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas and then enact the bill into law it would read like this:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is respectfully requested to consider the expediency of opening negotiations—*

Now, in my judgment, it would not look at all well for Congress to "enact"—that is, to make a law—"That the President is requested to consider the advisability" of doing something or other.

Regardless of what I might think of the wisdom or policy of ultimately passing a resolution containing the substance of the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Texas, I would not cast my vote in favor of inserting the language I have quoted after the enacting clause of a bill.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment and debate is important not only for the intrinsic merit—and there is some intrinsic merit in the resolution, or proposed amendment, I am sure all of us agree—but it is more important than all because of the fact that it tears from this bill its mask of pretense and false witness.

In the very title of the bill we have this unusual phrase, "A bill to declare," and so forth. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], in his learned way, preceding me, said that everything after the word "That," after the enacting clause, is a part of a bill; and accordingly we have bills "to provide" and bills "to enact," but it is unusual for us to have a bill "to declare." The title of the bill, in part, reads:

To declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands.

I say that statement is false witness and does not state the purpose of the bill. When that provision is put into the title there is deception practiced; there is an attempt to fool somebody.

There can not be any possible legitimate and honest excuse for putting those words into the title unless you do really want to declare the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands. And if you do want to declare the status of the people of the Philippine Islands, according to the title itself,

you ought to take up this amendment and consider it on its merits, and, if it is not in the proper form, change the form, and declare the status according to your convictions.

The suggestion was made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] that the proposed amendment would destroy the integrity of the bill. I do not think it would destroy the integrity of the bill; but I think the debate on this amendment does disclose and does enable us to put our finger on the portion of the bill which is pretense, which is not sincerely written, and which bears false witness.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. BRYAN. I regret I have not the time now. I have only a short time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] said that he might vote for this if it was made an amendment to the preamble. I see he dissents, but he said he would be willing, perhaps, to consider it. He did not commit himself. But he said if it were in order, or if it were proper anywhere, it would be in connection with the preamble. It is understood that the preamble is no part of the bill, and if you put this proviso or this amendment establishing the status of the Philippine Islands anywhere in the bill it must be only in that portion of the bill which is not a part of the bill.

Why go on with that pretense? Why not amend the title by striking out the totally false portion which I have quoted, so that it will read "A bill to provide a more autonomous form of government for the Philippine Islands"? That would be honest and make it accord with your declaration. You say it is an organic act. You say it is to enable them to govern themselves internally. You say it is not designed to establish the political status of the islands. You say that that is not the purpose of the bill. Then why include it falsely in the title? You can not fool yourselves. Do you suppose you can fool the American people? You may fool the Filipino for a while, but not for long. You pass this farce of a title and preamble to this bill to-day and they will want their "complete independence" to-morrow. Why indulge in this pretense? Why put this preamble into the statutes and into the history of our dealings with these people to stare us in the face for all time to come in handling those islands and to more or less interfere with our proceedings over there, and console yourselves with the sweet unction that not a word of it is binding or has any meaning, but that it is mere rubbish, surplusage, sop?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. I want to know if the gentleman is in favor of the permanent retention of the islands?

Mr. BRYAN. I am in favor of the retention of the islands, surely until we can have at least such an assurance or agreement as to international neutralization as is suggested by the amendment; and I believe that that time is so far removed in the future that no human being can see it, no person can discern it, no person can forecast the time when we can make such an agreement as that. The burden we have upon our shoulders in connection with the Philippine Islands involves particularly the warlike nation near to the Philippine Islands, and particularly the future relations of Japan and the United States. Why were all those 16 battleships sent around the world? Were they sent around to Japan merely to say "How do you do"? Were they sent around there in pure frolic or sheer folly? No. They were sent around the world because there was a great emergency on, a great and dire necessity for us to do that particular thing; the genius of statesmanship was demanded, and the man on the job was equal to the occasion. Anyone who does not realize that a threat and a menace is gathering upon the horizon of the Pacific fails to see what is there; having eyes, he refuses to see, he declines to look at the facts of the case.

If Japan ever attacks us, they will strike the Philippines first. Who is silly enough to believe all the great powers will ever agree to help us defend the Philippines against Japan through somebody's dream of international neutrality? Why would any great power agree to send its warships to shoot Japan out of the water if that nation should violate the territorial integrity of the Philippine Islands? It is none of their quarrel or responsibility. Russia tried that once. England is Japan's ally. Germany has wanted the islands herself, and France would laugh at the proposition.

There has never yet been submitted a proposition like the one set forth in this preamble, which winds up with the proposition "complete independence." None of the party platforms have provided for complete independence. They provide for independence with a string to it.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said that he stood against ever granting them independence. The American people may not be quite ready to swallow that in its entirety and to agree with him that we will never grant them independence, but the American people will approve the statement that we will never give the Philippine Islands "complete independence"; that we will never put ourselves in a position where we will either abandon our moral obligations or let loose the hold that we have there for commercial and other purposes in that great Pacific Ocean. I believe that instead of indulging in vain preambles like this, which are purely rubbish, fake, and pretense, we ought to do everything possible to establish a firm hold on the Philippines and to fortify them against attack with all the ingenuity known to man.

You Democrats who have met some of these problems in the South; you Democrats, who are just as patriotic, of course, as the rest of us, would not turn the Philippines loose for a minute and would not stand for an instant for the policy of bringing upon us the things that would be brought down upon us by the unqualified independence of the Philippine Islands. I think that instead of indulging in this preamble to a bill—just think how silly it is—you ought to let it be known that it is our intention to establish a firm hold out there and not abandon the means that are necessary for a truly stable government in the Philippines and in our island possessions in that greatest of all the oceans. The people of the Pacific coast have the right to expect it. They have the right to demand it.

When Robert Gray, before the National Constitution was adopted—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. BRYAN. Let me have two minutes more, please.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question if he gets it?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes; I will yield gladly.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I will ask the gentleman if he is in favor of unrestricted immigration from the Philippine Islands to the Pacific Coast States?

Mr. BRYAN. Of course I am not.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Then you would have people tied to us politically without their having the privilege of coming into this country?

Mr. BRYAN. Does the gentleman from Texas favor unrestricted immigration from Haiti?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I do not. I am asking the gentleman a question.

Mr. BRYAN. We do not favor unrestricted immigration from Porto Rico or from Cuba or from any of those places. But when Robert Gray cruised in the Pacific Ocean and established a title to the Oregon country he made it necessary that the United States—that the Government of the United States—take part in the development of the Pacific Ocean. He and his collaborators gave to us a Pacific Ocean destiny by giving us the Oregon country by right of discovery long before the Louisiana Purchase; and, as has already been shown, our islands and possessions are situated there in such a way that we have got to hold on, and hold on strongly. They extend in every direction; they are everywhere in the Pacific. There is no sense in talking about moving our boundary in a little bit and thinking that will give us safety. If we give away the Philippines, then Guam and Tutuila and Wake, then next we will be asked to give away the Hawaiian Islands, and then the Aleutian Islands and Alaska, and foreign nations will then own them all, and we will get into our shell and be safe. Any such policy as that is ridiculous. What will become of the statesmanship and the accomplishments of our fathers. I say we ought to put our battleships into the Pacific Ocean and hold our coasts and our boundaries and our island dependencies, and go forward with a firm hand for the commercial advancement of the country, and the necessary economic conditions ought to be considered.

Instead of passing useless preambles of this kind, which mean nothing in fact, but which will disturb our relations and encourage the Manila politicians to intrigue and revolution and make the nations of the world spurn us as unfit for our



duty, let us go forward, giving to these people the same kind of freedom we have been giving them, in greater and greater portions, and let them know that they are not fit for self-government till they learn to love the Stars and Stripes, and then they can have all the self-government that any true American wants. [Applause.]

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Chairman, upon the declaration of war between the United States and Spain it was declared that that war was not waged for territorial aggrandizement or commercial advantage. The speech made by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] seems to suggest a different thought. But I do not wish to discuss this question now. I rise only for the purpose of making a statement in reference to a remark made a moment ago by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY] and another of similar character made yesterday by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. These gentlemen said that no proposal to grant independence to the Philippines with the protection of the United States should be considered. I wish to say that I do not know of anybody who is proposing it. This bill does not propose or contemplate it, the Filipino people are not asking for it, and, so far as I can gather from my acquaintance with the membership of this House, there is not one on either side of the aisle who believes in it. The Filipino people do not ask for independence with the protection of the United States, because that would not be independence. When we ask for independence, we mean that when you are ready to grant us independence we want you to grant us complete, absolute, unrestricted independence, without taking any responsibility upon yourselves, and therefore without power or control of any kind over us. When you give us independence we shall expect to take the full responsibility for our domestic as well as foreign affairs. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall not waste much time in a discussion as to whether this proposal should have been considered in connection with the preamble or with the body of the bill—though it is clear to my mind that it ought not to have been offered at this point in the bill—for I want to discuss its merits.

Let no man think that a treaty neutralizing the Philippines would be a medium for relieving the United States of America from responsibility touching those islands. [Applause.] If you want to get free of any responsibility for the Philippines, then you must turn them loose, without regard to whether other nations will respect their independence or not. Why, you have to look behind you no longer than a little over 30 days to realize that one of the great nations of the earth claimed as a justification for its participation in the European war its obligation to uphold a treaty of neutrality that it entered into and which it claimed another nation had wrongfully violated. Does anybody suppose that by undertaking to neutralize the Philippines by an agreement with all the nations of the earth we thereby remove ourselves from all responsibility? Suppose that was done, and after it was done one of the powers party to the agreement chose to disregard it, what position would America be in? It would be in the position either of ignoring its obligations under a solemn treaty or of undertaking a war to enforce the observance of that treaty. Gentlemen, let us not be swept off our feet touching the Philippines. No man here is wise enough to span the future with any legislative enactment that will meet the test of all time. We are going far enough when we carry out our obligations to give to those people opportunity to develop and to show themselves capable in time of taking a place among the nations of the world, without undertaking to say now that we will fix that status before it has arrived and that we will fix the relationship that shall exist between us and them and all other nations.

Mr. BURGESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will yield for a question.

Mr. BURGESS. What about the two Democratic platforms declaring for neutrality?

Mr. SHERLEY. I simply say to you that I am prepared to meet that situation when we get to the point of declaring the independence of the Philippine Islands, and we have not reached that point yet.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; for a question.

Mr. FESS. I agree entirely to what the gentleman from Kentucky has said. But does it not apply to the preamble to this bill?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; I think not, for a very distinct reason. There is an entire difference. We are declaring in the preamble that we propose to travel a certain road, which is the ultimate independence of the Philippine people. If we adopted this proposal we would be declaring that we are now asking that there be a neutralization under certain conditions as to trade

and otherwise; and I for one am not prepared to say that I now favor that, or that I would favor it in the future. [Applause.] I am not willing to cross that bridge until I get to it in the process of time. The proposal does not pertain to the matter that is before us. For instance, you state in this proposal that the treaty that shall be entered into for Philippine neutrality shall provide for equality of treatment of all the world. It is quite possible, and it would be showing no more than a certain degree of gratitude if, when the time comes for the Philippines to take their place among the nations of the world, there should be a preferential relationship between the Philippine Islands and the United States of America. [Applause.] Are we prepared now to say that we propose to put that from us, no matter what the condition may be that confronts us at that day? What you are asked to do now is to anticipate the future. Why, if I favored the proposition of the gentleman, I would not and could not favor the bill that is before this House. In that case I would believe that the Philippines had reached a point in the world's history to warrant their taking a place as a nation, and I would propose that, and not simply propose to continue the relationship between that country and the United States of America. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, to me it would not be important whether this amendment were to be inserted in the bill after the word "enacted" or agreed to in a joint resolution after the word "resolved," because in the eye of the law the two words mean the same thing.

If it is the purpose of the majority side of the House at this time to remember their party platform, which they usually forget when brought to a crisis, they will vote for the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS], because they have frequently declared in favor of the proposition, not only in their party platforms, but on the stump in campaigns before the people.

And as in my recollection there is no instance since the Democratic majority was in the last House, and is in this one, where they have voted in accordance with any declaration they have made in the party platform, I do not anticipate that they will vary from their consistency in that respect and vote now in favor of a proposition that is in accordance with the party platform. Hence I assume, as usual, they will vote contrary to the party platform, and vote down the proposition offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The whereas to this bill says:

That it is the purpose of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands, and to recognize their independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein.

Why, there is a stable government established there now. The government there is as stable as it is in the United States, and if perchance the gentleman should say that that means a stable government with Philippine officials, that would not be possible under the terms of this bill, because the Governor General will still be nominated by the President and will be an American citizen. Here is a proposition to do something in the future, when something happens which now exists, if it is possible to exist at all. Either there is a stable government there now, for which we ought to make a declaration of independence of the Philippine Islands, or else there is no possibility of establishing such a government under the terms of the bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. The vice of the gentleman's position is—

Mr. MANN. Oh, I did not yield to the gentleman from Kentucky to tell me what the vice of my position is.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman is so particular as to the form in which the proposition is stated, I do not care to put it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not need to. I did not interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman will find that when he has interrupted me I have yielded to him without question and without undertaking to state the terms upon which I yielded.

Mr. MANN. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not take it at all with good grace, coming from the gentleman from Kentucky, after he asked me to yield, to start in by saying that the vice of my position is so and so. The vice of the gentleman's position is that he does not agree with the majority side of the House to which he belongs. He has never agreed with them on the Philippine question, and now they do not agree with the party platform, and no one can tell what they mean. The gentleman from Virginia or no one else over there will undertake to say what they mean, except in glittering generalities, depending upon the distant future. [Applause on the Republican side.]



Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, the criticism of the gentleman from Illinois touching the meaning of the language contained in the preamble is more apparent than real. The vice—and I use now in my own time the word that seems to have gotten so much on the nerves of the very sensitive leader of the minority—the vice of the gentleman's contention lies in the assumption that the present bill, if it shall be enacted into law, shall be the only enactment touching the Filipino people and the Philippine Islands. The purpose of this bill is to give to the Filipino people a larger control over their affairs, that we may determine their capacity for even a greater control until we reach the point where they can be given complete control. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And it is not inconsistent with such legislation to declare that the ultimate goal at which we aim is Philippine independence. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is the common sense of the bill. That is the construction that all men seeking to deal with a great question fairly, instead of hunting for an excuse for a grammatical criticism of the bill, would see by even casually reading it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I would not to-day vote to give to the Philippines immediate, absolute independence. I do not know that 20 years from now I would be prepared to vote to grant them absolute independence. But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Oklahoma declare in effect that we are never to give freedom to the Filipino people, and that we are forever to retain the Philippine Islands. This has raised an issue never before injected into the politics of this country, an issue of transcendent importance for us thoroughly to understand. In this connection I invite attention to the words of an acknowledged master of constitutional law, Judge Thomas M. Cooley:

The Territories. The Constitution was made for the States, not for the Territories. It confers power to govern Territories, but in exercising this the United States is a sovereign dealing with dependent territory according as in its wisdom shall seem politic, wise, and just, having regard to its own interests as well as to those of the people of the Territories.

In this dependence of the Territories upon the Central Government there is some outward resemblance to the condition of the American Colonies under the British Crown; but there are some differences which are important, and indeed vital. The first of these is that the territorial condition is understood under the Constitution to be merely temporary and preparatory, and the people of the Territories while it continues are assured of the right to create and establish State institutions for themselves so soon as the population shall be sufficient and the local conditions suitable, while the British colonial system contained no promise or assurance of any but a dependent government indefinitely.

Observe that last clause—

the British colonial system contained no promise or assurance of any but a dependent government indefinitely.

Thus, according to this great jurist, our permanent retention of the Philippine Islands would mean our adoption of the British colonial system. And yet we are a republic, and one of the cardinal tenets of our political faith is that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. [Applause.]

I would like to have some gentleman answer that statement of the illustrious Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Michigan that the territorial condition is understood under the Constitution to be merely temporary and preparatory, and that while that condition continues the people of the Territories are assured of statehood when the population shall be sufficient and local conditions suitable.

Mr. Chairman, the Filipino people differ from us in many ways. They are possessed of domestic and personal virtues. They have intellect and conscience. They have made rapid progress in recent years. But they differ from us ethnologically. They are another race, and they are 10,000 miles away, and yet it is said that they must forever remain subject to us. Is that true? Will they ever be admitted to statehood? Are we to adopt the British colonial system?

Mr. Chairman, the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, made in 1848, at the conclusion of the War with Mexico, contained the following provision:

The Mexicans who, in the territories aforesaid, shall not preserve the character of citizens of the Mexican Republic, conformably with what is stipulated in the preceding article, shall be incorporated into the Union of the United States and be admitted, at the proper time (to be judged of by the Congress of the United States) to the enjoyment of all the rights of citizens of the United States according to the principles of the Constitution; and in the meantime shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and property, and secured in the free exercise of their religion without restriction.

That was a promise that some time in the future, in the discretion of Congress, they should be made citizens of the United States. Sixty years passed away before Congress thought that New Mexico and Arizona were fitted for statehood. I do not know when Congress will be prepared to say the Filipinos are fitted for independent government, but as an American, the descendant of a soldier of the Revolution, who died of exposure and was buried beneath the snows of Canada, I shall not declare that the Republic established by that revolution is forever to hold in subjugation millions of Filipinos and Malays 10,000 miles from our shores. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN and by Mr. BURGESS) there were—ayes 14, noes 58.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That all inhabitants of the Philippine Islands continuing to reside therein who were Spanish subjects on the 11th day of April, 1899, and then resided in said islands, and their children born subsequent thereto, shall be deemed and held to be citizens of the Philippine Islands, except such as shall have elected to preserve their allegiance to the Crown of Spain in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain, signed at Paris December 10, 1898, and except such others as have since become citizens of some other country: *Provided*, That the Philippine Legislature, herein provided for, is hereby authorized to provide by law for the acquisition of Philippine citizenship by those natives of the Philippine Islands who do not come within the foregoing provisions, the natives of the insular possessions of the United States, and such other persons residing in the Philippine Islands who are citizens of the United States, or who could become citizens of the United States under the laws of the United States if residing therein.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. My friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES], the distinguished chairman of the committee, this morning stated, referring to me:

At the time that the gentleman made his statement, when he stated that it was historically true, I asked if he could name a single reputable historian who had ever made that charge against Gen. Aguinaldo, and his reply was that he could name one, and that was Dean C. Worcester. Mr. Chairman, I have since that time carefully examined Mr. Worcester's book. I have read every line that is in his book upon that subject, and I can not find a single line or word in that book which justifies the statement made by my friend from California.

On page 22 of volume 1 of Dean C. Worcester's *The Philippines, Past and Present*, there is a paragraph which refers to some of the controversies between Aguinaldo and some of his people. The gentleman quoted only a portion of that paragraph. If my friend had looked on page 20 of that volume he would have found the following:

In August, 1896, an insurrection against Spain had broken out in the Philippines under the leadership of Emilio Aguinaldo, a resident of Cavite Viejo, who had been a school-teacher and was at that time gobernadorcillo of his town.

It had been terminated by the so-called treaty of Biacnabato, signed in Manila on December 15, 1897.

This document provided for the surrender of Don Emilio Aguinaldo, supreme chief of the insurgents in arms, and Don Marclano Llanera and Don Baldomero Aguinaldo, his subordinates, together with their soldiers and arms.

"The excellent señor general in chief" of the Spanish forces was to "provide the necessary means of supporting the lives" of those who surrendered before a certain fixed date.

In actual practice what was done was to agree to pay them \$800,000 in three installments, the first of \$400,000, the second and third of \$200,000 each.

Aguinaldo and certain other leaders were to take up their residence outside the islands. Their deportation was duly provided for, and Aguinaldo and 20 of his companions were taken to Hongkong on the Spanish steamer *Uranus*, arriving there on December 31, 1897.

On January 2, 1898, \$400,000 were deposited in the Hongkong Bank to the credit of Aguinaldo & Co.

The insurgent leaders remaining at Biacnabato had a meeting under the presidency of Isabelo Artacho, an Ilocano, who was the ranking officer in the absence of Aguinaldo, and requested that the second installment of \$200,000 be paid to them. The Spanish governor general, Primo de Rivera, acceded to their request, and they divided the money, although Aguinaldo denied their right to do so, claiming that it should have been sent to Hongkong.

On page 24 of the same work is this statement:

Artacho, who had received ₱5,000 as his share of the second payment, arrived in Hongkong, and on April 5 demanded ₱200,000 of the insurgent funds, probably under the agreement that he should establish a company in Hongkong for the benefit of the former leaders and not merely of those who had accompanied Aguinaldo. But the leaders in Hongkong had denounced that agreement, and refused to pay.

That bears out the fact that they were quarreling among themselves about the money, just as I stated on the floor yesterday. Now, I will read further:

He then entered suit before the supreme court of Hongkong, calling upon Aguinaldo for an accounting of the trust funds deposited in his hands for the benefit of Artacho and others, and asked for an injunction restraining Aguinaldo or any member of the junta from handling or disposing of any part of said funds. He filed as evidence copies of the Biacnabato agreement and of the agreement made by the leaders on December 19. This suit was brought not merely in the name of Artacho, but in that of all the exiles who were described as living in exile in Hongkong in accordance with an agreement made with the Spanish Government. Artacho probably had adherents among these



men, some at least of whom were utterly weary of waiting in Hongkong and of living upon what was doled out to them. Some at least saw no chance of any other fate than indefinite exile spent in dependence upon the inner group for even the means of existence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for three minutes in order to finish this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KAHN (reading)—

The suit was in equity and called for an accounting of the trust funds which the complainant recognized were legally in the hands of Aguinaldo. It could be carried on only with great difficulty without his presence and without his account books. Meetings were held, and Artacho was denounced as attempting to extort blackmail, but he refused to yield, and Aguinaldo, rather than explain the inner workings of the Hongkong junta before a British court, prepared for flight. A summons was issued for his appearance before the supreme court of Hongkong on April 13, 1898, but he was by that time beyond its jurisdiction.

He drew out the \$50,000 from the Chartered Bank, which had become due, according to the terms of the deposit, and perhaps such other sums as could be drawn upon by check, engaged passage for Europe by way of Singapore for G. H. del Pilar, J. M. Leyba, and himself under assumed names, appointed V. Belarmino to succeed to his functions, and gave him checks signed in blank to draw the interest of the sums on deposit to provide for the support of the exiles. He gave as his reason for departure that he was going to remain under cover until Artacho could be bought off, but he intended to go far afield for this purpose, as he gave his destination as Europe and the United States.

That is what Worcester says in this book regarding the doings of the Filipino junta in Hongkong. It seems to me that when an insurgent chief, or a number of insurgent chiefs, sign a treaty to lay down their arms and go into exile for \$800,000, while the governing power is supposed to be carrying out an agreement to effect certain reforms, it looks pretty much like a sell out. Worcester quotes Maj. J. R. M. Taylor, of the United States Army. Maj. Taylor was an officer in our Army who was fully conversant with the Spanish language.

During the time we were putting down the insurrection in the Philippines we came into possession of many of the state papers of the Filipino revolutionary government, and Maj. Taylor made the translations for this Government. This latter part of the excerpt from the book by Dean Worcester, to which I have referred, is from Taylor's translation of documents on file in the War Department, and is generally designated "Philippine Insurgent Documents." [Applause.]

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words in behalf of Gen. Aguinaldo. I was at one time an officer in the Philippine Army. I was little more than a boy then. I left college in response to the call of my country to fight under her flag. I fought for two years during the Philippine revolution. It was a horrible war, as all wars are. The Philippine Army was scarcely armed, clothed, and fed, and it was facing one of the best-equipped, best-drilled, most gallant armies of the world. I took part in many a battle. For several months I was on the staff of Gen. Aguinaldo, then President of the Philippine Republic and commanding general of its army. Of course I had occasion to know Gen. Aguinaldo well and intimately, and from personal observation I say that he is a man of high character and patriotism.

The revolution against Spain was the outcome of a long peaceful campaign carried on, not precisely for independence, but to secure from the Spanish Crown a more liberal government in the Philippine Islands. The revolution started in 1896, and in 1897 the Spanish governor general at Manila sought to secure peace by entering into an agreement with the Filipino leaders of the rebellion. It was agreed that the demands for governmental reforms should be granted, and that \$800,000 in Mexican money, which was then the currency of the Philippine Islands, should be given to the revolutionists, as indemnity for the damages done to them and their families on account of that war, and as a payment for the guns that they surrendered, and—as it was agreed they should leave the Philippine Islands—also as a means of providing for their support and maintenance abroad. In view of the fact that the Spanish Government had agreed to grant all the liberal reforms asked for by the Filipinos before the revolution started, no one can question the right, nay, the duty, of the Filipino revolutionists to end a contest which was causing so much loss of life and property to our country, and which evidently, at that time, could not accomplish more than what Spain had promised to concede. Aguinaldo, therefore, and his followers agreed to leave their country and not to return to the land that they had wished to live and die in. But they were willing to make this sacrifice, and to go far from their beloved ones, so that their people might receive and enjoy in peace the liberal reforms that were promised them. If these Filipino exiles, who had fought for their country, and who

were to be denied the right to live in it, had in fact used the money paid them by the Spanish Government for their own purposes, can anyone question their right to do so? Could they not properly have divided this money among themselves, that they might comfortably live thereon?

I have no doubt that if the Filipino people had been asked to vote on the question whether or not these men should receive that money, they would have decided that it be given to them. Yet Aguinaldo and his companions did not make such a use of the funds placed in their hands. They deposited the money paid to them—which never reached the total sum promised—in the bank and only used the interest. They lived in Hongkong in almost complete poverty. Why did they do this? Because they did not know whether Spain would or would not actually comply with the agreement. They were accustomed to see promises broken by that Government, and therefore they kept the fund intact for patriotic purposes. They decided that if Spain, after they had left the Philippines, should fail to grant to the people of the Philippine Islands the liberal reforms that were promised, they would, as was their right, use the money to buy guns, and would by force compel the Spanish Government, that had betrayed them, to comply with the agreement.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUEZON. With pleasure.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I just wish to ask a question for information. Why was it considered that it was necessary for Aguinaldo and his associates to leave the Philippine Islands?

Mr. QUEZON. Because the Spanish Government feared that if they remained in the Philippines they would continue to foment revolution. As Spain failed to keep faith, this money was actually used to buy guns.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from the Philippine Islands has expired.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from the Philippines have five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia how late he expects to run this evening?

Mr. JONES. Not much after 5 o'clock, I think.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUEZON. I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that this money, when Spain did not comply with her part of the bargain, when she refused to introduce in the Philippines those reforms that were asked, was used by Aguinaldo to buy guns, and with those guns we helped the United States in prosecuting her War with Spain. Our aim in that war is well known, and I shall not discuss it. But I want to say that we had retaken every town garrisoned by the Spanish, with the exception of Manila, which we were besieging, so that when the United States sent her troops there all she needed was a few thousand men, and with those few thousand men she compelled the surrender of the garrison of Manila.

I want to say another word about Gen. Aguinaldo. As I said before, I know him personally. I had served under him when I was little more than a boy. Gentlemen, Aguinaldo at one time wielded great power in the Philippines. During the revolution, of course, he was the principal military chief, with the powers of a dictator, just as the President of the United States would be a dictator here in case of war. He had all power, both civil and military, in his hands during the war. He had in his pocket the key to the treasury of the then independent Philippine Government, including both that raised by taxation and that received from contributions. He had the confidence of the people. Nobody asked him what he was doing with the money. The time came when he was captured by Gen. Funston. He had then been exercising his authority for more than two years, but when the war was over Aguinaldo was as poor as he was when the war started. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I want the gentlemen on this floor to bear in mind this fact: I do not wish to make invidious comparisons with others, but I want to ask you how many revolutionary chiefs in other parts of the world who had the opportunity would have done what Aguinaldo did? How many would have been willing to go back to their homes as poor as ever after having had in their possession so much money that they could have appropriated without question? Aguinaldo is poor to-day. He is a simple farmer. Aguinaldo has not even accepted any

position from the American Government, although it was ready to give him a good position. He has not even gone into politics. He has not tried to gain political preferment, even through the popular vote.

Why? He wanted to show the world that he fought for his country, not because of desire of personal profit or power, but out of patriotism, and that when he could not fight any longer he could go to his home and lead a peaceful and modest life, the life of a good citizen, working upon his farm, as he is doing now. Thus Aguinaldo has demonstrated that the Filipinos who had known how to fight know likewise how to work in time of peace. I need say no more. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the reading of my amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I do not imagine that any Member who heard the statement of my friend from California [Mr. KAHN] thinks it necessary for me to make any reply thereto. I had read every word read by him very carefully before he read it, and I listened very carefully to his reading, and I submit that there is not one single word in what he has read that justifies the statement that he made on the floor of this House on yesterday.

I will read the statement made by him as that statement appears in the RECORD. He said:

My friend from Missouri is not familiar with Philippine history. Nearly six months before our entrance upon the scene the leaders of the revolution against Spain had sold out their people.

I asked the gentleman this question:

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California has made some exceedingly derogatory remarks about the leaders and patriots of the Philippine Islands. He has said that they sold out the liberties of their people to the Spanish Government, and that his charges were historical facts. I want to ask the gentleman if he can vouch a single respectable authority for that statement. Does he know of any history ever written of the Philippines that contains any such statement?

His reply was:

The treaty of Biacnabato speaks for itself. And not only that, but Dr. Dean C. Worcester states the same thing in his work entitled "The Philippines, Past and Present."

Now, I submit that what the gentleman has just read from Mr. Worcester's book does not justify his statement that Aguinaldo and his associates sold out the Filipino people. This morning I read from the works of a number of historians to the effect that the charge repeated by the gentleman on yesterday was a baseless one, and that Aguinaldo's conduct in this transaction was entirely honorable and conscientious. What I charged the gentleman with saying was that Aguinaldo had sold out his people, and he said he could substantiate it from the Worcester book.

Mr. Worcester himself does not say a word on the subject. He simply quotes from the report of an Army officer setting forth in much detail all the facts connected with the treaty of Biacnabato. Nowhere in that report, or elsewhere in the book in which it is contained, is there to be found a charge that Aguinaldo and his associates sold out the people of the Philippines. That is the unsupported and oft-repeated statement of the gentleman from California.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. KAHN. Does not the gentleman know that the treaty of Biacnabato provided for the exile of Aguinaldo and some of his followers, and that he was to receive \$300,000 on condition of his going away? Can the gentleman imagine George Washington or John Adams or any of the American patriots during our Revolution selling out for \$300,000, or any other amount, and agreeing to go away?

Mr. BRYAN. And taking the money with them.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who represents the Philippine Islands here [Mr. QUEZON] has fully explained that occurrence. He has stated that the Spanish authorities agreed that they would grant the reforms for which Aguinaldo and his associates were fighting if they would agree to leave the islands; and, in order to avert further bloodshed, they agreed to expatriate themselves. After they had done so they discovered that the Spaniards had refused to keep their pledged word, and then they used the money that had been given them, not for their personal purposes but to buy arms with which to compel them to live up to the terms of the treaty of Biacnabato. What was there dishonorable in this?

Mr. KAHN. That is not as I understand it from my reading of the account of the transaction as set forth in Dr. Worcester's work.

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Clerk to report my amendment.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman from Virginia yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LEVY] is recognized.

Mr. LEVY. I ask the Clerk to report my amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Between lines 9 and 10, page 3, insert the following as portion of section 2:

"That the Government of the Philippines shall reimburse the Government of the United States for all moneys expended by said Government of the United States in the purchase, protection, and government of the Philippine Islands, and said reimbursement shall be made in payments of gold out of any surplus in the Philippine treasury, or by 3 per cent Philippine Government bonds."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, is that offered as an amendment to section 3?

Mr. MANN. No; it is an amendment to section 2.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman offer his amendment as an amendment to section 2, or as a separate section?

Mr. LEVY. To be added to section 2.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee reserves a point of order.

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill. I believe it ought to pass, but I do not believe that we should be a benevolent institution. We have expended on the Philippine Islands, in purchase and otherwise, over \$200,000,000, and while it will be a long time before they can repay it, I think the Philippine Government ought to recognize their indebtedness to the United States, as a result of which they have their freedom, and they ought in some way to recognize the vast sum of money expended by the Government of the United States. We have been in this business before. For instance, from 1903 to 1909, in our intervention in Cuba, we expended \$3,500,000, and we have never received a cent of it back. My idea is that the United States should stop this grand benevolent business of scattering money all over the world.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE. Does not the gentleman think the Burgess amendment, which we debated at some length, would have covered that exigency?

Mr. LEVY. No; I do not think it would have covered it. This bill will give them more than opportunity to qualify themselves for independence.

Mr. MOORE. Is it the opinion of the gentleman that this bill would take the United States out of the Philippines and leave everything there that we have spent upon the Philippines?

Mr. LEVY. I believe they ought to recognize the indebtedness of their government to us by giving us a bond as an evidence that they owe us the money. I believe the time will come when they will be very rich, when they will be able to repay us what we expended on them.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman did not get the point of my question. I wanted to know whether it was the theory of the gentleman from New York that if we passed this bill and leave the Philippines we will leave behind us everything that we have spent upon them?

Mr. LEVY. No; I want the Filipino people to recognize what the United States has done for them.

Mr. MOORE. How much have we spent in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. LEVY. Two hundred and fifty millions and over.

Mr. MOORE. And we would stand to lose it all if we pass this bill in its present form?

Mr. LEVY. Yes. I will give you a little history in relation to the Filipinos with which, perhaps, few of you are acquainted. I remember once calling on the late distinguished and lamented President of the United States, Mr. McKinley, and I said, "Why did you take over the Philippines?" He said, Well, he was very much opposed to acquiring them; that he did not want to take over the Philippines, but we were in such a position that we could not help ourselves. He further said that this country was under great obligations to Great Britain for the assistance their navy had rendered the United States; that this Government had ascertained that the German Government had made a treaty, or was about to make a treaty, with Spain that in case we did not take over the Philippines they would purchase the archipelago. This would have caused war between Germany and Great Britain, and so we had to take them over to avoid a great conflict. That was the explanation of the distinguished President of the United States, Mr. McKinley. I do not think it does us any good to hold on to the Philippine Islands.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is not germane.



Mr. LEVY. I think it is germane, Mr. Chairman, and I am willing to discuss the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think that the amendment is germane to the section, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Flood of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 18459, relating to the Philippine Islands, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following requests for leave of absence:

Mr. MONTAGUE for five days, beginning September 28, on account of illness.

Mr. FERGUSSON for four days on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to these requests?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to observe that these gentlemen seem to have a remarkable degree of prophecy in knowing just how long they are going to be ill—one for five days and another for four days. I do not object, however.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS IN THE RECORD.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of land legislation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### COTTON.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House meets on Monday next, after the approval of the Journal I may have consent to address the House for 40 minutes on the subject of cotton.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the House meets on Monday, immediately after the approval of the Journal and the disposal of such matters as have to be attended to he may address the House for 40 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I see that the gentleman from Alabama is here. He did not want to let me have 15 minutes this morning.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state that, as far as I am concerned, I would like to have the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] have an opportunity to address the House, and also my colleague from Alabama. As I stated this morning, I would like to have the Philippine bill disposed of before anything intervenes, unless it can be suspension of the rules on Monday.

Mr. MANN. I do not see any chance of disposing of the Philippine bill for a week. However, I shall not object to the request of the gentleman from Alabama if he will make it so that I can have 40 minutes also.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to all these requests for unanimous consent.

Mr. HEFLIN. I will ask the gentleman to withhold that for a minute.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, it is time that this Congress adjourned [applause], and I am going to object to each and all requests for unanimous consent.

Mr. HEFLIN. I want to say to the gentleman that the South is in great distress. The cotton industry is in a desperate condition. The price of cotton is less than the cost of production. I want to discuss the situation, and surely the gentleman from Connecticut will not deny me that privilege.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to reply—

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. DONOVAN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. HEFLIN. I want to serve notice on the gentleman that we will not adjourn, if I can prevent it, until we are heard on the cotton question and some relief is had for the 30,000,000 of people who are now greatly suffering on account of conditions created by the war in Europe.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the regular order has been demanded.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already put the question.

Mr. MANN. But the regular order is to go back into the Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the Philippine bill, unless the gentleman moves to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The committee rose regularly and the gentleman from Georgia was addressing the Chair.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a telegram upon the cotton question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentlemen on that side of the House how many thousand telegrams have been received upon that subject and whether it is the intention to insert them all in the Record?

Mr. EDWARDS. It is impossible to tell the gentleman the number, but I have received only one myself, which I desire to insert in the Record.

Mr. MANN. I have received a great many myself, and I object.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to print in the Record a letter that I this day addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury in regard to the cotton situation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to print in the Record a letter which he addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury on the subject of cotton.

Mr. HENRY. And currency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Until we can have some debate upon the matter, I object.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 6440. An act to authorize the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. and the Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at St. Paul, Minn.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, October 3, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Court of Claims, transmitting findings of fact and conclusions in the case of Asa G. Gallup et al., heirs of Ada O. Gallup, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1170), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. WEBB, from the Committee on the Judiciary, under authority of House resolution 234, authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to inquire into and concerning the official conduct of Emory Speer, United States district judge for the southern district of Georgia, submitted a report thereon (No. 1176), which said report was referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 19075) to authorize and direct the payment of pensions monthly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 19076) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 19077) to authorize exploration for and disposition of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium or sodium, and metalliferous ores in unallotted Indian lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BULKLEY: A bill (H. R. 19078) granting the consent of Congress to the Cleveland Yacht Club Co. to construct a bridge across the west arm of Rocky River, Ohio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 19079) granting an increase of pension to William A. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 19080) for the relief of John Hoffman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 19081) granting an increase of pension to William Rech; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 19082) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 19083) granting a pension to William H. Peary; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 19084) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 19085) to remove the charge of absence without leave from the military record of John E. Hubbard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 19086) granting a pension to Adolph Dirmyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19087) granting an increase of pension to George W. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LENROOT: A bill (H. R. 19088) granting a pension to Edward H. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 19089) granting an increase of pension to James T. Darnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 19090) to reimburse the officers and enlisted men of the Revenue-Cutter Service and Public Health Service for losses sustained in the wreck of the revenue cutter *Tahoma*; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 19091) granting a pension to Malissa E. Bovee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 19092) granting a pension to Frank Stires; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19093) granting an increase of pension to Henry Engle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of various merchants, bankers, and farmers of Jefferson County, Okla., favoring a tax of \$5 per bale on each bale of cotton raised in excess of 25 bales in 1915; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of Harry S. McCartney, of Chicago, Ill., proposing that the United States Congress send a memorial to all nations engaged in war, relative to a cessation of hostilities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of the American Truth Society of New York, deploring the crippling of American commerce by the European war and petitioning for relief; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), memorial of the Kansas City (Mo.) Branch Railway Mail Service, relative to admitting railway postal clerks to Army and Navy Hospital on same basis as enlisted men; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition of various members of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Mayville, Mich., protesting against House bill 16004, for railroad tracks opposite Sibley Hospital in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FAISON: Petition of sundry citizens of Salemburg, N. C., favoring Henry cotton bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GILMORE: Petition of sundry citizens of Randolph, Mass., and the Thatcher Brotherhood of Milton, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of the Taunton (Mass.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring a revision of the patent laws; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition of 56 citizens of Springfield, Ill., against tax on cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 228 citizens of Iowa, Illinois, and Wisconsin, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of the Thatcher Bros. Banking Co. and other banks of Logan, Utah, against tax on banks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Utah State Federation of Labor, favoring House bill 10735, to create a bureau of safety in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the Court of Common Council of Hartford, Conn., favoring the passage of the Hamill bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of Clyde H. Proper, of Schoharie, N. Y., and W. B. Van Alstyne, of Kinderhook, N. Y., against legislation to prevent the purchasing of stamped envelopes with address thereon from post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, protest of George Peck, of Martindale, N. Y., manager of Gayety Theater, Washington, D. C., against special tax on theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of Jordan Philip, cashier First National Bank of Hudson, N. Y., against taxation of capital stock and surplus of banks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of Lodge No. 360, Fraternal Brotherhood of Maple Leaf, and the Chamber of Commerce of Oakland, Cal., favoring the Hamill bill (H. R. 15139) relative to retirement of aged civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, resolutions of the San Francisco Labor Council, of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the landing in the United States of alien Chinese seamen; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REILLY of Wisconsin: Petition signed by numerous citizens of Chilton, Wis., of different nationalities, protesting against the attempt by certain papers to create prejudice in the minds of the American people against Germany and Germany's cause in the pending European contest; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SLOAN: Petition of numerous merchants and citizens of Wilber, Clatonia, Plymouth, Exeter, Valparaiso, Touhy, Memphis, Ashland, Cortland, Pickrell, Ithaca, Weston, Diller, Jansen, Harbine, Bee, Hebron, Bruno, Geneva, Ohio, Swanton, Fairmont, Daykin, Tobias, Friend, Milford, Pleasant Dale, Dorchester, Seward, all of the fourth congressional district of Nebraska, favoring support of House bill 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of the Christian Endeavor Union of Worcester County, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

## SENATE.

SATURDAY, October 3, 1914.

(Legislative day of Monday, September 28, 1914.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

## EMERGENCY REVENUE LEGISLATION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate certain communications, which will be noted in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance. They have to do with the pending revenue measure.

The communications were referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

[Telegram.]

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., October 2, 1914.

HON. THOMAS R. MARSHALL,  
Washington, D. C.:

Proposed selling tax of \$1 per horsepower on automobile manufacturers is the greatest menace to the industry in its history, owing to the contracts existing with dealers. Tax can not be passed on to consumers, and will fall as an unjustifiable burden principally upon the States of Michigan and Indiana. Automobile manufacturing is one of the few industries that has kept the spark of industrialism alive in the United States during the long depression the country has been passing through. The automobile manufacturing industry as a whole is in no condition to stand this discriminatory tax. Please get in touch with your colleagues, calling their attention to the gravity of the situation before irreparable injury is done.

NORDYKE & MARMON CO.

[Telegram.]

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., October 2, 1914.

HON. THOMAS R. MARSHALL,  
Washington, D. C.:

As representative of a State now depending upon the automobile industry for a great part of her commercial success, the proposed tax on automobile manufacturers should appeal to you as a most damaging and ruinous act. The burden of the tax would fall on Indiana and Michigan, and we are depending upon you as our representative to prevent any such discriminating legislation. We are confident you will do all in your power to prevent the enactment of this law, which would mean ruin to the most flourishing industry of our State.

STUZZ MOTOR CAR CO.